Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 - s42A Report Section Topic - Entire Plan Change

Order	Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	S42A Overview Report Section
1	S1.001	Neil Lindsay	Entire Plan Change	Support	Approve the Plan Change.	I would like to state my support for the entirety of Plan Change 29. Plan Change 29 will help enable quality intensification in the town and provide more housing choices. I am a renter in my mid-twenties and would love to live in an apartment or townhouse closer to Nelson Town. Currently, the only choice I have is a standalone house. I would love to be closer to the shops and amenities in the town without having to take care of a standalone house. While it is unlikely that high-density housing will be developed for a long time, I still feel it is important that people (especially young people) can choose the kind of housing that works for them. There will always be low-density residential options for people who like that, but Plan Change 29 provides an alternative. I also feel it is important to note that young people will be vastly under-represented in these submissions. Most young people (especially in Nelson) want more housing choices, more action on climate change, more effective public transport, and higher density. Plan Change 29 helps to enable all of these things. I remind councillors and other decisionmakers that the demographic of submitters is unlikely to be representative of the population as a whole and to not forget the often unheard voices of Nelson's young people.	Accept	Section 9
2	S3.001	Stephanie Gray	Mapping	Oppose	Cancel the rezoning of large parts of Nelson South, from the proposed high density residential status, to medium density.	1. Sunshine and health Nelson South already suffers from poor housing stock, with inequities in health, wellbeing and socio-economics outcomes arising from this. The value of sunshine, for old NZ homes, might be intangible but could be calculated in terms of the effects on health, happiness, social connectedness, how children play, and on how a family fares in that home. 2. Community counts, and so does safety The streets in my neighbourhood, around Tipahi Street, Hampden St and Kawai Street, might not have 'heritage value' but they have immense community value. The balance of cars, to pedestrians and cyclists (a large number of whom are school children) is at a tipping point and the council has invested in road calming and safety measures (such as the closure of the end of Hampden St). How will 'high density' maintain safety, with the inevitable increase in cars and traffic? Simply building highrises without parking will not discourage car ownership either. Nelson is decades away from the culture shift needed to separate Kiwis from cars. 3. Housing values If you are lucky enough to own your own home in Nelson South, you've probably got a mortgage with a bit of equity. That equity is threatened to erode. Who would buy a bungalow, villa or 1940s weatherboard house, as lovingly kept and renovated as they may be, with high-rise boxes on either side, looming over and blocking the sun? 4. Flight With areas like Stoke already emerging as preferable for the co-ed schooling and community facilities that Nelson lacks, has NCC factored in the increase in flight to these regions by home owners and renters alike, for whom this is a last straw? [Refer to the original submission for further details.]	Accept	Section 12

3	S3.002	Stephanie Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. The public meeting at Victory Community Centre was less than useful. Specific questions about Nelson South could not be answered. Council communications that require the public to take a solutions-based approach to the proposal is unfair and insulting. To identify a problem in a submission is enough, its then for the council to find solutions. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. This is unreasonable and wrong. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4	S3.003	Stephanie Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
5	S3.004	Stephanie Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
6	S3.006	Stephanie Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S3.005.	Reject	Section 13
7	S3.010	Stephanie Gray	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
8	S3.011	Stephanie Gray	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 12
9	FS28.001	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 in part	Section 12
10	S3.013	Stephanie Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
11	S3.018	Stephanie Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.Reject	Refer to reasons in submission point S3.005 and S3.011.	Reject	Section 13

12	S3.019	Stephanie Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
13	S3.026	Stephanie Gray	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.	Accept in part	Section 13
14	S3.028	Stephanie Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
15	S3.029	Stephanie Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
16	S5.001	Carol Parkinson	Mapping	Oppose	Do not change the zoning for Stoke central from general (low) residential to high density.	I oppose 3 or 6 story buildings or apartments being built in the quiet street I live in without Council or neighbour consultation. I object to an apartment being built within a metre of the boundary! we brought this property to semi-retire, we have a small one-story home that would be completely blocked of natural light & sunlight (warmth), RE.3.i If our neighbours were to build a 3 or 6 story building (or multiple buildings) next to us. we would also lose our privacy, RE2.4.i. The additional traffic, parking issues, noise & loss of privacy would destroy our quiet enjoyment of this peaceful neighbourhood. we purchased here to have easy access to amenities: the beach, the shopping/supermarket, chemist, Doctors & the parks. we purchased here to be closer to grandchildren, to help out with childcare & to contribute to our community. we cannot afford to move into a retirement village or similar. we saved & worked hard to finally purchase a home here in expensive Nelson. We deliberately purchased in Stoke to be out of the city, to have quieter neighbours & walking access to parks & other quiet spaces. Large/tall buildings are not compatible with the current character of the neighbourhood. RE2.5. REd.6 should be maintained so our residential area has quiet, peaceful surroundings. AB2.2 should be maintained where land use, height of housing/shading neighbours & location and operation of activities avoids noise which could adversely affect people.	Reject	Section 12
17	S9.001	Michael Playford	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Restrict] 3 story residential to the CBD, along Waimea Road and in existing industrial zoned areas.	Up behind Hampden St school is already very congested and can barely cope with congestion already. Increased urban density will make this much worse and destroy the quality of our neighborhood.	Reject	Section 12

18	FS28.121	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Restrict 3 story residential to the CBD, along Waimea Road and in existing Industrial Areas. The Tahunanui (flat) area is largely outside the PC29 boundaries and comprises a large area of industrial zoning. Allowing 3 story residential as a permitted activity within existing industrial areas is not appropriate in particular those areas subject to specific Nelson Airport Effects, Height and Noise Overlays which are 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
19	S10.002	Nicola Roberts	Mapping	Oppose in part	Amend to apply [medium density] to the inner city only and maybe one street around.	This is because that area already has higher story so impact of living minimal. I also feel if you are going to negatively affect areas surrounding nelson city you should impact all areas - why only some eg: the wood v the Brook? This makes no sense and is unfair.	Reject	Section 12
20	S11.001	Oliver Whalley	Residential Zones	Support	Approve the proposed change to allow higher density in the general residential zone in Upper Brook Street. Proceed with the change as proposed.	The space available in the upper Brook could be more efficiently developed to provide housing for Nelson which is in dire need of it.	Reject in Part	Section 12
21	S12.001	Emily Gardwell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Council to scrap this plan.	This change will drastically reduce the quality of life for many nelson residents. To build a 3 or 6 story block next to a single level house will make that home dark, cold, damp and reduce privacy. Without sufficient light our houses become unhappy places to live, cost extra to heat. They become damp, causing illnesses like asthma. Most of the streets ear marked for possible development are quiet, residential streets and totally inappropriate for 6 storey blocks. Terrace housing is much more preferable.	Reject	Section 9
22	S15.001	Barbara Edwards	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Completely revisit the whole Intensification scheme and consider other options.	1. Council must thoroughly examine overseas research on multi-storey accommodation showing over-riding negative effects, relating to lack of socialisation and no feeling of ownership, resulting in poor 'community' climate and hence anti-social behaviour, more crime, children playing unsupervised or merely 'watched' from one of the storeys, and more. 2. These arbitrary designations of areas for the 3 levels of intensification need to be completely redesigned, with due consideration of the type of housing and neighbourhoods, property values (which have been shown to be drastically reduced). 3. Council should instead of multi-storey housing, build row-housing or staggered row housing which has worked well (e.g. Christchurch) AND has many advantages: more socialising, less crime, people feel prouder of their home, each has a small garden for socialising, growing veggies, kids to be able to play etc. etc. Much better in the long-term for the neighbourhood too.	Reject	Section 13
23	S17.001	Caroline Edgar	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Decline plan change 29.	I am concerned that the current plan will see many people loose sun and cause shade around their homes. Leading to colder, damp prone homes which are unhealthy and cost much more to heat. Building multi story housing which causes other homes to lose their sun is not the answer.	Reject	Section 9
24	S18.001	Chante Whitehouse	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the plan change.	I feel this is good to continue development of Nelson, increase housing availability close to the city, reduce traffic, enhance walking/cycling and invigorate the CBD.	Accept in part	Section 12

25	S19.004	Mike Ball	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Delay the decision making around this momentous change to allow genuine consultation with the residents and consideration of their points of view.	The commissioners considering submissions needs to be entirely independent of the Council. No councillors should be involved. Their role should only be to consider the recommendations of the INDEPENDENT commissioners and whether to support or disagree with those recommenDATIONS. As more information is coming to light, it has become apparent that the process around this proposed change has been terrible. The people potentially most affected by these changes (the current residents of Nelson) have found it difficult to get information in an understandable format and even harder to work out how to express understandable concerns through the submission process. I'm reasonably intelligent and computer literate but I have found it difficult to the point of almost giving up. The only reason I haven't is that I think if this plan goes through as it is it will be disastrous for the future of the place I have called home for the last 24 years. I am very concerned that this is a 'done deal' in that the commissioners will include a majority of Nelson City Councillors with already formed ideas in support of the Plan.	Reject	Section 13
26	S20.001	Tim Bayley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	The last 2 1/2 months have been incredibly stressful for a lot of Nelson homeowners and tenants as they battle to preserve their hard won amenities against Council and its planners who want to bring in Plan Change 29... Why did they not ask us first before writing it into a 2000 page legal document?... I have found Plan 29 very had to get ones head around [sic] it is an extremely long and boring legal planning documents, only to be read and understand by planners and is mind numbing to the average resident who it effects... The information provided over the last 10 + weeks has changed... We have all struggled with this new incredibly complex E Plan with it's many layers of extremely complex planning jargon. I understand that this is the future but it is so difficult for the average person to understand this and what it all means. Refer to the original submission sections 1, 11, 12 and 13 for more detail.	Reject	Section 9
27	FS31.001	Stephen Webster		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
28	FS62.001	Janet Southwick		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
29	FS74.001	Henry Hudson		Support	Accept	Reject Entire Plan Change in its entirety: I concur with rejecting/opposing the specific items identified by Tim Bayley.	Reject	Section 9

30	FS75.001	David Gibson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
31	FS83.001	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
32	FS72.001	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. This plan is out of step with the NZ Central Government's proposed plans for development. The NZ Government has indicated a lack of support for the previous Government's position on densification. Until more direction is given, this has the potential to be a waste of Council and Ratepayers' funds and time following an outdated Central Government brief. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
33	FS66.003	Carol Webster		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
34	FS61.001	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
35	FS76.001	Robert Stevenson(1)		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
36	FS54.001	Nicole Gibson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13

37	FS53.001	Susan Gibson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
38	FS46.001	Dan McGuire		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
39	FS77.001	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
40	FS58.001	Robert Stevenson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
41	FS60.001	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
42	S20.006	Tim Bayley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Maintain the integrity of the city, we need reasoned, well thought out development across the city that works with each different neighbourhood. We need proper planning with design criteria that works and does not disadvantage the existing residents for the benefit of the new.	This plan changes most of the existing rules that have governed Nelson's development over the past 150 years. Home ownership is the aim of most of us and is the biggest single financial decision that we will ever make in our lives. We all chose carefully and in sunny Nelson we buy or build to a number of major points sunshine, view, size and layout etc... The integrity of our city must be retained. This is a great little city and we all love living here but this could easily be destroyed by allowing people to build up indiscriminately blocking out the sunlight from existing residents. Refer to the original submission sections 1, 5 & 10 for more detail.	Reject	Section 9

43	FS32.009	Peter Olorenshaw		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The current planning rules have not been in force for 150 years, but rather only since the 1950's or 60s mandated sprawl. Before that, a more appropriate and natural density profile radiating out from the city centre. Houses built in pre-war times close into the city centre were often built quite close to boundaries and above 7.5m tall and would not comply with present planning regulations. The submitters much admired previous house is a case in point that breaks current height and daylighting regulations as do houses in the bottom of Shelbourne Street. The latter with their 2 story high (almost) adjoining walls are a reflection of appropriate density for close-in to city centre sections like this.	Reject	Section 9
44	FS83.006	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
45	S20.008	Tim Bayley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Support the establishment of an Urban Development Agency.	This is the direction we should be pursuing where planning is actually planning across the whole spectrum of the society and the total area of Nelson and Tasman. Refer to the original submission section 8 for more detail.	Accept in part	Section 12
46	FS83.008	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Accept	Section 9
47	S20.009	Tim Bayley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Support neighbourhood planning.	Plan Change 29 is just planning by developers not by design. This is just "lazy" planning where you "open-up" all the zoning rules to allow almost anything to be built at the detriment of the existing residents. It is not the way to plan a smart cohesive city where we all get the benefits of living in this great area. We need real planning that has a proper design criteria for each neighbourhood. We need planning that looks at each neighbourhood by its existing build character as what is good and bad and how we can work with each neighbourhood to improve and to provide increased density without adversely effecting (sic) the existing residents. New buildings need to fit into the existing fabric of each neighbourhood but as it stands with Plan Change 29 we have absolutely no input into this and we have to rely on the very Planners who designed this zoning change to make sure we will not get [substandard development inferred]. Refer to the original submission sections 8 & 9 for more detail.	Reject	Section 12
48	FS83.009	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
49	S20.012	Tim Bayley	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Introduce a new semi commercial rating system that penalises homeowners owners who are making commercial gain from renting out houses or apartments [as short term living accommodation such] as Air BnB's. The money collected by the rating surcharge should be used to reduce rents in a "geared to income" rental scheme [as requested below in submission point S20.018.]	This would discourage this activity and hopefully some of the housing would come back into the long term market to help solve the housing issue. Refer to the original submission section 14 for more detail.	Reject	Section 13
50	FS83.012	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
51	S20.014	Tim Bayley	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Introduce rates penalty or surcharge to discourage houses left empty for more than 4 months at a time.	To encourage more units back in the local market to help solve the housing issue. Refer to the original submission section 15 for more detail.	Reject	Section 9
52	FS83.014	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
53	S20.015	Tim Bayley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts.	Why are NCC Planners using population numbers way higher that are require by central government, which only requires the medium of Statistics NZ. So by 2048 we are having to intensify for an extra 7000 people. Why would we do that? Refer to the original submission section 16 for more detail.	Reject	Section 10
54	FS83.015	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12

55	S20.018	Tim Bayley	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Make funds available (from the targeted rates collected from proposals in submission points S20.012 and S20.014) to encourage 2nd dwellings on existing properties with the rents set at affordable or "geared to income amounts".	Refer to reasons in submission point S20.017 and the original submission section 18 for more detail.	Reject	Section 12
56	FS83.018	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
57	S20.020	Tim Bayley	Infrastructure	Amend	Auckland Point could be redeveloped as a new modern school.	Refer to reasons in submission point S20.019 and the original submission section 19 for more detail.	Reject	Section 12
58	FS83.020	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
59	S22.001	Mark Sherlaw	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Limit the areas of housing intensification rather than the huge area proposed, some areas are suitable but not all the area in the plan change.	The new plan change 29 is not very well thought through. The areas for intensification really need looking at. At this early stage the areas cover too much ground, the high density areas need to be smaller rather than right through the city. I also feel the land along the Matai River on both sides should really be "LOW DENSITY" it is one of the most beautiful parts of Nelson and a great joy to the many people that use it. At present it is an open/ green/social/recreational area and its openness is its greatest virtue it doesn't need to be denigrated with cheap box like houses which happens all over the world with high intensification of houses. I have also read-up on the statistics and I really cannot see where this huge demand for housing is coming from. Nelson was not mandated by the Labour government to increase housing as were the larger cities. Some intensification maybe desirable in some areas but once we have built over and around the areas that are a draw card to live in Nelson we then just end up with yet another built out squalid little city.	Accept in part	Section 12
60	S25.001	Claudia Bustos Lee	Entire Plan Change	Support	Go ahead with the plan and build up! We need more homes!	We need more homes in Nelson!	Accept	Section 12
61	S26.001	Eddie Allnutt	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Plan 29 is cancelled / withdraw and a more considerate plan is developed; get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	I do find the Plan 29 flawed. So flawed, I reject it in its entirety, but if it is not rejected then here are my feelings It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
62	S26.004	Eddie Allnutt	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Consult] local residents and [take] our views into serious consideration.	I am also concerned about the rest of the city and believe careful planning and design needs to be done if Nelson is to be intensified. It needs to be done with care and respect for existing residents. Nelson should be a beautiful city and have its own style. Not quickly and cheaply designed by developers out to make a buck. Residents shouldn't be pitted on each other so a well thought out plan needs to be made. Made with input of the local residents and actual architects/designers who care about now and the future.	Reject	Section 13
63	S26.006	Eddie Allnutt	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, [or alternatively] we suggest that the Hearings Panel should have at least four and preferably five members with a quorum of three, and no more than one elected member.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting. To us, it is much more important that the Commissioners have the training and experience to engage with technical experts and understand and apply technical expert considerations and evidence on technical subjects , including in this case traffic and geotechnical engineering. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

64	S26.008	Eddie Allnutt	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
65	S26.014	Eddie Allnutt	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
66	S26.015	Eddie Allnutt	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 12
67	FS28.002	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 in part	Section 12
68	S26.017	Eddie Allnutt	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
69	S26.022	Eddie Allnutt	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S26.009 and S26.015.	Reject	Section 13
70	S26.023	Eddie Allnutt	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
71	FS80.001	Phillipa Stark		Support	Accept	Destruction of existing neighbourhoods for non demonstrated outcomes or necessity. Reluctance to consider viable options.	Reject	Section 12
72	S26.031	Eddie Allnutt	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

73	S26.032	Eddie Allnutt	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
74	S26.033	Eddie Allnutt	Mapping	Not Stated	[Seek] that the zoning of the Mount St Hill remain for low density housing.	"Mount Street Hill"(Mount St, Konini St, Locking St and Wellington Streets, between Kerr St in the north, Wellington St and Renwick Place to the east, Locking Tce and the walkway to Vanguard St to the south, and extending at several points to Vanguard St in the west). Due to the instability of the land and the narrow streets this should be considered to be low density, not medium density. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12
75	S26.040	Eddie Allnutt	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S26.009.	Reject	Section 13
76	S26.043	Eddie Allnutt	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
77	S29.001	Janet Southwick	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw the plan change [inferred].	Plan 29. My concerns are as follows: My home, on the Maitai and Brook is in a flood zone, half the street is single family and 10 house down the street we are considered High density. A 3-6 story building along my fence line would block all of my sun and I have now decided to cancel my solar panels as my roof would not receive any winter or summer sun. The Sun provides vital vitamin D especially for children and older people, and lack of it will have adverse effects on residents overall well being. It also will shade my small productive vegetable garden. Further there is presently a parking problem in our area and with the 'infill' it is irresponsible to plan these buildings without at least a minimum 1 parking space per unit. I feel the 'planners have just thrown a 'blanket' over all of Nelson without any real thought or planning. While urban development is essential for progress we must also preserve the unique character and quality of life that small residential areas offer. There is no guarantee it will lead to more affordable housing and developers will capitalise on the demand for urban living. The planners need to pick 'certain sites' for development rather than ruin existing neighbourhoods.Infrastructure, traffic congestion, lack of green space should also be considered. This plan needs to go back to the drawing board.		Section 12
78	S32.001	Michael Town	Entire Plan Change	Support	Pass this plan change.	I generally support this plan change as land use changes are needed to provide an urban form that supports accessibility and lower emissions from the transport network. By allowing greater density, people can [live] closer to existing centres and get there without relying on private vehicles to do so.	Accept	Section 9

79	S34.001	Mike Ward	Entire Plan Change	Support	Approve the Plan Change.	While I may have a different view on how to achieve intensification I agree with the intention. When I wrote a housing strategy at the request of Mayor Rachel Reese and her deputy Paul Mattheson during the 2013- 2016 term of council , I pointed out that while Nelson may have had a shortage of houses, there was likely no shortage of housing or structures capable of reconfiguring to provide dwellings. I recall figures at the time indicating that the surplus of larger dwellings was roughly half of shortfall in demand for smaller dwellings. It doesn't take a genius to work out that reconfiguring even a portion of the surplus into two or more smaller apartments would make a relatively inexpensive contribution to meeting the housing deficit. At the time I wrote my strategy the average occupancy of homes in the city was something less than 2.5 people per dwelling with around 26% of all households being single person households... those figures were arrived at three censuses ago. If trends have continued as predicted by demographers, single person households will have almost certainly increased and occupancy levels fallen. I am aware that conventional wisdom says that we need to build up. There are households and locations where going up is appropriate but while the saving in land is admirable, multi story apartments are questionable as affordable or a community building housing options. Affordability and supply are important issues but as mayor Nick points out housing is a transport issue. Whatever strategies we adopt they should not be at the expense of housing's lifestyle, health, energy, community building, and aesthetic potential. Where and how we build dwellings is also potentially the single biggest contributor to the city meeting its climate change mitigation	Accept	Section 9
80	S35.001	Danny Hutchinson	Mapping	Oppose	The high density zone should not extend as far as Tukuka Street. The upper reaches of this area [should be] reduced to medium density.	The high density zone goes too far up the Nelson South Valley. I live on Tukuka St, so in the case of Tukuka Street I can speak with years of personal experience. I believe that 6 story buildings are too tall for this area. The reason being is that this end of the valley is already quite shaded by the hills. Tall buildings will reduce the sun significantly for some residents. The evidence that 6 story buildings are too high for this area can be seen every day in winter as the houses across Tukuka Street are significantly shaded by Nelson intermediate school. Multi story buildings definitely can have large adverse effects, as I have stated above, they must go through a very robust resource consent process and must be contestable. I could support this in more open areas, where sunlight is less of an issue.	Accept	Section 12
81	S36.001	Sarah-Jane Weir	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Council should approach intensification in a manner that is better planned with respect to the effect on residential neighbourhoods and to the city overall, more thoughtfully balancing the needs of current and future generations, and ensuring a cohesive city character remains.	I oppose PC 29 in its entirety. I have come to the view that PC29 does not appropriately deal with intensification. It proposes too extensive a response, too quickly, it has not been well communicated given the extent of the change, and it fails to take account of the character of our regional city. Nelson has enough housing capacity until 2038. Total capacity enabled under PC29 is 5-9 times long term (30 year) demand. Council hasn't appropriately balanced current and (potential) future generational amenity. Intensification in PC29 is too large a scale with too many unknowns and insufficient evidence to proceed as proposed. Council's own processes and planning information to date speak to lower density, quality and more planned intensification than the proposed MDZ and HDZ under PC29. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
82	FS70.002	Michael and Sita Monaghan		Support	Accept	Submission supported in full.	Accept in part	Section 9
83	FS78.001	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 12

84	S36.002	Sarah-Jane Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	No High Density Zone applies to any area that is currently a (residential) Standard Area or Low Density Area.	The large-scale nature of the proposed HDZ and MDZ into current residential areas risks a "lottery" effect on individual properties and neighbourhoods. So in a current low density neighbourhood, zoned HDZ under PC29, a 6 storey building can be erected close to neighbouring boundaries that is visually out of character with any other existing building (from a scale perspective), that removes sunlight and daylight from immediate neighbours, and with no thought of effect on safety of for example, the pedestrian character of a neighbourhood. If a 6 storey apartment block within the parameters of the HDZ is erected anywhere in a residential neighbourhood, the neighbouring properties will suffer a loss of amenity values (privacy, daylight, "neighbourliness", and property value). In terms of all Low Density neighbourhoods that are proposed to be rezoned, the scale of change is phenomenal. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
85	FS40.003	Belinda Reburn		Support	Accept	The submission point identifies the 'lottery' effect that the proposed HDZ and MDZ will have on individual properties and neighbourhoods. This is a likely effect of the current plan change, further demonstrating where the current iteration of PC29 is lacking in consultation and consideration of the effects of development that Auckland has already suffered.	Reject	Section 13
86	FS70.003	Michael and Sita Monaghan		Support	Accept	Submission supported in full.	Accept in part	Section 9
87	FS78.440	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 12
88	S36.003	Sarah-Jane Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	No Medium Density Zone applies to any area that is currently a (residential) Standard Area or Low Density Area.	Refer to reasons in submission point S36.002.	Accept in part	Section 12
89	FS70.004	Michael and Sita Monaghan		Support	Accept	Submission supported in full.	Accept in part	Section 9
90	FS78.441	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 12
91	S36.005	Sarah-Jane Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	The HDZ 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
92	FS70.006	Michael and Sita Monaghan		Support	Accept	Submission supported in full.	Accept in part	Section 9
93	FS78.443	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 12
94	S36.006	Sarah-Jane Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	The HDZ does not extend beyond any areas that were shown as potential High Density in the 2019 Nelson FDS (or the 2022 FDS).	At this time, any intensification should be moderate and more in line with the 2019 FDS in terms of the areas to which it applies, the sort of intensification enabled and quality constraints. I have referred to the 2019 FDS because to me, it speaks of a document that was better and more widely consulted on in terms of what intensification to existing areas might look like, and it anticipated a gradual process. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12

95	FS40.004	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.	Accept in part	Section 12
96	FS70.007	Michael and Sita Monaghan		Support	Accept	Submission supported in full.	Accept in part	Section 9
97	FS78.444	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 12
98	S36.009	Sarah-Jane Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	The MDZ does not extend beyond any areas that were shown as potential Medium Density in the 2019 Nelson FDS (or the 2022 FDS).	At this time, any intensification should be moderate and more in line with the 2019 FDS in terms of the areas to which it applies, the sort of intensification enabled and quality constraints. I have referred to the 2019 FDS because to me, it speaks of a document that was better and more widely consulted on in terms of what intensification to existing areas might look like, and it anticipated a gradual process. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
99	FS70.0010	Michael and Sita Monaghan		Support	Accept	Submission supported in full.	Accept in part	Section 9
100	FS78.447	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 12
101	S36.012	Sarah-Jane Weir	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Ensure sufficient planned access to green spaces [and] biodiversity is not adversely affected.	Council should work towards its residents having planned functional green space, access to outdoors and sunlight/daylight. [Which requires understanding] how and where people will use outdoor spaces for leisure and having that space available. Especially in a town with a high uptake of people using the outdoors to play and be active in.	Accept in part	Section 12
102	FS70.013	Michael and Sita Monaghan		Support	Accept	Submission supported in full.	Accept in part	Section 9
103	FS78.450	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 12
104	S36.014	Sarah-Jane Weir	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	More intense zones need to be appropriately sited and controlled and be at appropriate scale, to take account of the neighbourhood within which they are sited.	To achieve quality and liveable intensification, comprehensive urban planning is required - not just permitting buildings wherever and whatever quality. It requires understanding what our neighbourhoods will look and feel like.	Accept in part	Section 12

105	FS40.006	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.	Accept in part	Section 12
106	FS70.001	Michael and Sita Monaghan		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: "To achieve quality and liveable intensification, comprehensive urban planning is required - not just permitting buildings wherever and whatever quality. It requires understanding what our neighbourhoods will look and feel like". The proposed Plan Change 29 does not encompass this understanding or look to consider a comprehensive Urban plan. Growth and development are important but now is the time to engage with the community and shape our city for the future. I urge the reconsidering of PC 29, with meaningful consultation and quality documentation afforded to the community to help shape our wonderful little city.	Reject	Section 13
107	FS78.452	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 12
108	S36.017	Sarah-Jane Weir	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Long term, substantive changes should be properly consulted on and if appropriate, enabled in the Whakamahere Wakatu Nelson Plan.	The scale of change, particularly as an "interim" response is unwarranted. Council has already begun work on a new plan, the draft Whakamahere Wakatu Nelson Plan. This will enable Council to properly consider what a well functioning Nelson urban environment entails. Refer to original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 9
109	FS70.017	Michael and Sita Monaghan		Support	Accept	Submission supported in full.	Accept in part	Section 9
110	FS78.455	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 12
111	S36.018	Sarah-Jane Weir	Inner City and City Fringe Zones	Oppose	Focus on intensified living in specific areas of the city, the CBD and potentially limited City Fringe.	I believe that a thriving Nelson CBD is more likely if there is combined office/residential/retail space. Post pandemic there is less demand for office space and this will continue; so it is even more important to concentrate on mixed use development. That should be [a] primary consideration for apartment style living.	Accept in part	Section 12
112	FS70.018	Michael and Sita Monaghan		Support	Accept	Submission supported in full.	Accept in part	Section 9
113	FS78.456	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 12
114	S36.019	Sarah-Jane Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain the current zoning of all residential neighbourhoods.	Until demand in the City areas is met for apartment living, all residential neighbourhoods should retain their current zoning. Council's own experts warn against instituting too large intensification zones, and that will dilute areas more appropriate for high density apartment development such as the City Centre.	Reject	Section 12

115	FS70.019	Michael and Sita Monaghan		Support	Accept	Submission supported in full.	Accept in part	Section 9
116	FS78.457	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 12
117	S36.020	Sarah-Jane Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	PC29 should at least treat my neighbourhood consistently with the area of Collingwood St south of Bronte Street [which is Medium Density Zone].	My own neighbourhood (part of N20, south of Manuka Street) has been subject to increasing proposals of intensification, but seemly without consideration of changing amenity as a result. The 2019 FDS shows my neighbourhood, Fairfield Park, as "two storey terrace housing and town houses on some sites". The Nelson Intensification Plan 2020 anticipates Fairfield Park as having "some 2 storey terraced housing and some town houses" The 2022 FDS shows my area as an Intensification Area, up to 3 storeys. The Draft Whakamahere Wakatu Nelson Plan anticipates "multi unit developments of 4 or more units in both the General Residential and Medium Density Residential Zones, where such development would require resource consent". Now my neighbourhood is proposed as High Density Zone, no consents required. But even in PC29, there are maps which show my area as Medium Density Zone (not high). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12
118	FS70.020	Michael and Sita Monaghan		Support	Accept	Submission supported in full.	Accept in part	Section 9
119	FS78.458	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 12
120	S36.021	Sarah-Jane Weir	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	For Council to appropriately engage with residents and provide accessible information in relation to PC29.	I have come to the view that Council has not appropriately engaged in its responsibilities to its residents to provide accessible information in relation to PC29. When I first saw Council's message about PC29, there was nothing to indicate the substantive nature of the changes or that it would affect my neighbourhood. I do not believe the Council has provided me and others with timely and reasonable access to relevant information in a way that is accessible. In particular, there was no modelling of what the proposed changes to height restrictions, recession planes/daylight admissions, site coverage, and yard setbacks are on residential properties. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
121	FS70.021	Michael and Sita Monaghan		Support	Accept	Submission supported in full.	Accept in part	Section 9
122	FS78.459	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 12
123	S38.001	Karen Driver	Entire Plan Change	Support	{Develop] a vision of what Nelson will look like and what amenities are provided, particularly community related spaces.	I support the concept of greater intensification of building in Nelson. I would like to see more of a plan on how the impacts of climate change and natural hazards on how Nelson will look like in the future, such as what areas will be retreated from and what do we want our city to look like. Most new building in the city is ugly, too much concrete and there seems to be no rules on the visual impact. It seems that developers can do what they want. As someone that does not understand the nuances of such plans I can't be specific, but I know that we need a vision of what Nelson will look like and what amenities are provided, particularly community related spaces.	Accept in part	Section 12

124	S39.001	Jane Peterson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Restrict any high density living (i.e. dwellings 3 stories or higher) to the Mixed Use and Centre City zones already set out in the draft Whakamahere Whakatū Nelson Plan and leave the areas currrently marked "high density" under PC 29 as they currently are.	- 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. The documents available online are not easy to follow and the consultation time is short given the impact of the changes. In addition there are inconsistencies between what has previously been proposed for the future growth and development of Nelson and what is being proposed in PC29. - Impact on amenity values 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. 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. It results in a lottery effect on amenity. These types of high rise developments may also be more likely to attract absentee owners and a poliferation of Air BnB type accomodation which will also negatively impact on the existing residents. - Congestion and parking issues High rise developments tend to exacerbate traffic congestion and parking problems. This is a particular concern for the streets in and around Hampden Street School and Nelson College (ie between Van Diemen Street and	Reject	Section 12
125	S39.002	Jane Peterson	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict any medium density living (i.e. dwellings 3 stories or higher) to the Mixed Use and Centre City zones already set out in the draft Whakamahere Whakatū Nelson Plan and leave the areas currrently marked "medium density" under PC 29 as they currently are.	Refer to reasons in submission point S39.001.	Reject	Section 12
126	S41.001	Nigel Lineham	Entire Plan Change	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 Whakatū Nelson Plan and leave the areas currently marked "high density" under PC 29 as they currently are.	I would be supportive of 4-6 story high rise developments in the middle of town (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, 2-3 story apartments and subdivided sections for low level builds. These types of high rise developments may also be more likely to attract absentee owners and a poliferation of Air BnB type accomodation which will also negatively impact on the existing residents in terms of noise, parking and transience. High rise developments tend to exacerbate traffic congestion and parking problems. The introduction of 6 story apartments through the neighbourhoods mentioned above could significantly impact current enjoyment of the use of property in an unacceptable way. Buildings this large, will cast long shadows, reducing sunlight (which is important for mental Health) and be a significant invasion of privacy. Residents using passive energy or solar to reduce energy consumption will be impacted badly. Whilst some of the infrastructure has been upgraded in the area, it is still not sufficient for the pressure of a large increase in the population in the area. At a time of increased significant weather events, many councils are focusing on how to increase the 'green sponge' benefits of communities to mitigate high water flows when the stormwater system cannot cope. Allowing an increase in higher density building will reduce the lawns and gardens	Reject	Section 12

127	S41.002	Nigel Lineham	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Any construction in the city fringe should be limited to 3 storeys, require off street parking and should not threaten existing infrastructure.	Refer to the reasons in S41.001.	Reject	Section 12
128	S42.001	Mary Bronsteter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject 100% Plan Change 29.	I'm very concerned about the lack of public (local) awareness on this issue, and the unacceptably short time frame for submissions. I'm also concerned that the relevant 'hearings panel' will have NCC Councillors as a majority, and so no doubt there will be a conflict of interest. This is a unsatisfactory state of affairs, and so I ask that the panel be changed - to be a majority of independent, unbiased members. My biggest concern is sunlight hours for all affected, environmental impact, parking, noise, privacy and social degradation. In particular, I object to Kainga Ora's plan to erect a 6 story building with 71x 1.5 bedroom units at 4 Examiner Street, Nelson for MSD poor clients with no income right in front of our home and many others. This is possible because of PC 29. How would you like to have a Franklyn sized apartment in front of your home? This is a peaceful residential neighbourhood and many of us have been here for more than 20 years. It should be unlawful to put poor people, intellectually disabled vulnerable adults housed together with other poor individuals and ex-convicts. It is a recipe for disaster. We will have no privacy and potential fear to walk in the neighbourhood. Nelson College for Girls is on the other side, nearby, so I would be concerned for my younger children. PLEASE do not allow this to pass. A two story with mixed social classes and of course a percentage of the poor should be allowed in any and all apartment complexes. I work for Tautoko Services/Options and we support individuals with intellectual disabilities. Many need proper housing, but imagine if you had an intellectually disabled daughter who wants to live on her own. Would you want your daughter to live in a 6 story apartment complex with only the poorest of society living there and next to ex-	Reject	Section 9
129	S42.002	Mary Bronsteter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S42.003.	Reject	Section 13
130	S42.003	Mary Bronsteter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
131	S42.004	Mary Bronsteter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
132	S42.005	Mary Bronsteter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
133	S42.007	Mary Bronsteter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S42.006.	Reject	Section 13

134	S42.011	Mary Bronsteter	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
135	S42.012	Mary Bronsteter	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 12
136	FS28.003	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 in part	Section 12
137	S42.014	Mary Bronsteter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
138	S42.019	Mary Bronsteter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S42.006 and S42.012.	Reject	Section 13
139	S42.020	Mary Bronsteter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
140	S42.027	Mary Bronsteter	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
141	S42.029	Mary Bronsteter	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
142	S42.030	Mary Bronsteter	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

143	S42.046	Mary Bronsteter	Mapping	Oppose	Object to the medium density zoning of the area surrounding our home on Wellington Street, Mount Street, Konini Streeet etc. This should remain low density housing for the steep terrain and dangerous outcomes.	Refer to reasons in submission points S284.001 - S284.005.	Reject	Section 12
144	S46.001	Freya Davison	Entire Plan Change	Support	Go ahead with the proposed changes to housing densification.	Agree with the Council's rationale.	Accept in part	Section 12
145	S47.001	Christopher Davison	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the proposed changes.	As per the reasons outlined on the NCC website. Densification must be accompanied by infrastructure such as transport and green spaces. Building regulations must ensure dwellings are well designed, high quality, warm, built to last, designed to be liveable and not excessively small.	Accept in part	Section 12
146	S48.001	Richard Peterson	Entire Plan Change	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 Whakatū Nelson Plan and leave the areas currrently marked "high density" under PC 29 as they currently are.	- 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. The documents available online are not easy to follow and the consultation time is short given the impact of the changes. In addition there are inconsistencies between what has previously been proposed for the future growth and development of Nelson and what is being proposed in PC29. - Impact on amenity values 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. 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. It results in a lottery effect on amenity. These types of high rise developments may also be more likely to attract absentee owners and a poliferation of Air BnB type accomodation which will also negatively impact on the existing residents. - Congestion and parking issues High rise developments tend to exacerbate traffic congestion and parking problems. This is a particular concern for the streets in and around Hampden Street School and Nelson College (ie between Van Diemen Street and	Reject	Section 12
147	FS33.001	Stephen Fitchett		Support	Accept	Lack of consultation given the range and complexities of the changes. I attended the Trafalgar Centre meeting but the soundproofing requirements for alterations to houses within 100 metres of State Highway 6 have received little (no??) publicity. Given the highway runs right through Nelson this clause will affect a great number of residents.	Reject	Section 13
148	S48.002	Richard Peterson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Restrict any medium density living (ie dwellings 3 stories or higher) to the Mixed Use and Centre City zones already set out in the draft Whakamahere Whakatū Nelson Plan and leave the areas currrently marked "medium density" under PC 29 as they currently are.	Refer to reasons in submission point S48.001.	Accept in part	Section 12

149	S49.001	Allison Silke	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Restrict any high density living (ie dwellings 3 stories or higher) to the Mixed Use and City Centre zones already set out in the draft Whakamahere Whakatu Nelson Plan and leave the areas currently marked "high density" under PC29 as they currently are.	We understand we need to increase the density of housing in the inner city and are supportive of developments in the middle of town where there are already commercial and high-rise buildings. I don't believe developers should be allowed to build 6 story high rise developments through existing family neighbourhoods, especially without resource consent. To be consistent with the Draft Nelson Plan and a more considerate approach for current residents to increase the density of housing in these areas would be to build 2 story apartments and subdivide sections. Building high rise developments would negatively impact our quality of life as it would interrupt the native factor of our neighbourhood, disrupt the skyline and ultimately block the sun and cast shadows over single story family homes. Not to mention the significant invasion of privacy as apartments loom over family outdoor spaces. Properties in our area were never build with the idea of high-rise building to be build next door so there currently isn't anything owners can do to minimise these significant impacts of lifestyle if a 6-story building was build next door. This plan could introduce a randomness of developments throughout the community where high-rise apartments overlook neighbouring yards and others are not affected. High rise buildings likely attract absentee owners, ie. Air bnb accommodation which will also negatively impact on existing residents. High rise developments will increase traffic congestion, lack of parking and safety issues for children, cyclists and pedestrians in our neighbourhood especially during school drop of and pick up times. These changes could lead to uncertainly and decreased property values as potential buyers are put off by the increasing high density living and high-rise buildings.	Reject	Section 12
150	S50.004	Robin Whalley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Abandon this plan change and start again following the steps we agreed to in the FDS.	The Future Development Strategy (FDS) (to which I submitted) requires and calls on council to develop neighbourhood plans. Council has failed to carry out this step.	Reject	Section 9
151	FS31.002	Stephen Webster		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again by following the FDS. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
152	FS75.002	David Gibson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again by following the FDS. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
153	FS83.024	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support in part	Accept in part	The Future Development Strategy - Council has failed NTFDS - Implementation Plan 2023 - pg 28 The importance of preparing neighbourhood plans for the successful implementation of the FDS.	Reject	Section 9

154	FS72.002	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again by following the FDS. This plan is out of step with the NZ Central Government's proposed plans for development. The NZ Government has indicated a lack of support for the previous Government's position on densification. Until more direction is given, this has the potential to be a waste of Council and Ratepayers' funds and time following an outdated Central Government brief. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
155	FS66.004	Carol Webster		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again by following the FDS. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
156	FS61.002	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again by following the FDS. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
157	FS76.002	Robert Stevenson(1)		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again by following the FDS. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
158	FS54.002	Nicole Gibson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again by following the FDS. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9

159	FS53.002	Susan Gibson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again by following the FDS. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
160	FS46.002	Dan McGuire		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again by following the FDS. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
161	FS77.002	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again by following the FDS. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
162	FS58.002	Robert Stevenson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again by following the FDS. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
163	FS60.002	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again by following the FDS. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
164	S50.005	Robin Whalley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Abandon Plan Change 29 and start again. Do it in accordance with the law.	Population data provided by DOT consulting is not provided in public documents. There is a complete lack of transparency which is contrary to the principles of good governance and participatory democracy. In my opinion the DOT report has been deliberately kept under wraps. I support the submission of Dr Hayes.	Reject	Section 9

165	FS31.003	Stephen Webster		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again. Do it in accordance with the law. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
166	FS20.003	Tim Bayley		Support	Accept	Robin is right on the money here. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
167	FS83.025	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support in part	Accept in part	DOT consulting is not provided.	Reject	Section 13
168	FS72.003	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again. Do it in accordance with the law. This plan is out of step with the NZ Central Government's proposed plans for development. The NZ Government has indicated a lack of support for the previous Government's position on densification. Until more direction is given, this has the potential to be a waste of Council and Ratepayers' funds and time following an outdated Central Government brief. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
169	FS66.005	Carol Webster		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again. Do it in accordance with the law. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
170	FS61.003	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again. Do it in accordance with the law. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13

171	FS76.003	Robert Stevenson(1)		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again. Do it in accordance with the law. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
172	FS54.003	Nicole Gibson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again. Do it in accordance with the law. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
173	FS53.003	Susan Gibson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again. Do it in accordance with the law. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
174	FS46.003	Dan McGuire		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again. Do it in accordance with the law. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
175	FS77.003	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again. Do it in accordance with the law. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
176	FS58.003	Robert Stevenson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again. Do it in accordance with the law. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13

177	FS60.003	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Abandon the plan and start again. Do it in accordance with the law. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
178	S51.001	Ruth Newton	Entire Plan Change	Support	[Support the Plan Change].	1. Increased housing density in the central city will encourage a vibrant community able to access resources on foot or by bicycle. 2. The improved bus service which hopefully will expand the timetable to include evenings and events allows access to outer areas if needed. 3. More people in the city and bus should reduce use of cars with resulting congestion. 4. This should reduce pressure for parking often, dull spaces in town, not all available to the general public. Ideally the centre of Nelson could be a total pedestrian precinct with only disability mobility vehicles and service or other utility vehicles allowed. 5. Very many cities, notably in Europe have increased housing density often over centuries. The result has not been a reduction in quality of provision. 6. I note that individual developments will need specific consent. In my view many of the arguments proffered in relation to blockage of light or anxiety about the height of buildings will be argued out at this stage. 7. House and apartment building have improved. Some developments following the Christchurch earthquake show imaginative design and technique. 8. To have a really interesting city housing should include variety of size and type. A proportion of new build can take account of changing family size and need. Nelson has a proportion of people who might prefer extended family living, some who would like cohousing as well as singles and couples who could use shared facilities - laundry, nursery etc. 9. Therefore as well as independent property developers public housing should have access to desirable sites. 10. More building in the city should reduce the amount of building in eg Kaka Valley etc. and Atawhai where there is slippage and plans are for the wrong type of building in the wrong place.	Accept	Section 9
179	S52.001	Gloria Lines	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose Plan Change 29.	My biggest concern with this proposed plan change is for the physical and mental health of both those who already live in established, stable, quiet, secure, and generally satisfied neighbourhoods and for the people the council is intending to be able to house. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
180	S52.003	Gloria Lines	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consult with the community before notifying a plan change [inferred] including asking homeless people what they think they need in terms of housing.	Council has not asked me what I think about this. We as a neighbourhood should have been consulted and included before this process was even started... If you allow Kianga Ora to go ahead and build even a three-storey apartment building on the corner of our block our lives will be changed forever... We are the people who live here. We know what it's like. We know how many more buildings, cars, and people this area can take. We object to having such enormous decisions being made for us about our lives in this undemocratic manner... I understand The Male Room, Ngati Rarua, and te Piki Oranga are currently engaged in a project asking homeless people what they think they need in term of housing. They are doing this before any money is spent on building. Would it not be sensible to do the same here? [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12

181	S52.004	Gloria Lines	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Start over and commission a new set of projections to be carried out by a competent demographer or otherwise employ the medium projections of Statistics NZand amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The Nelson City Council's population projection on which the Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment (HBA) is based on, is flawed. The "method" that NCC employed is not consistent with the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. The NCC did not employ a qualified demographer to do "bespoke" projections, nor did they use the Statistics NZ's projections as recommended by the NPSUD. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
182	S52.005	Gloria Lines	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider the impacts on property values [inferred].	As a former property investor, I fully understand the impact on property values. That at least 25% and up to 50% of the value of my property will be lost. What could I buy to replace this property with that amount of money? [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
183	S52.006	Gloria Lines	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Require Kainga Ora to tenant existing properties before building more houses [Inferred].	I understand there are many empty Kianga Ora properties all over the country sitting untenanted. Would it not be sensible to tenant them before building more? Given the parlous state of our economy, would it not be prudent to not enable Kianga Ora to waste millions of our tax payers dollars on buildings that are not required?	Reject	Section 13
184	S52.008	Gloria Lines	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors from either side of the Sept 14th vote, or replace all councillors on the hearings panel with independent commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
185	S52.010	Gloria Lines	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S52.009.	Reject	Section 13
186	S52.014	Gloria Lines	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
187	S52.015	Gloria Lines	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 12
188	FS28.004	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 in part	Section 12
189	S52.017	Gloria Lines	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
190	S52.022	Gloria Lines	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocatetheir house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providingthey comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S52.009 and S52.015.	Reject	Section 13

191	S52.023	Gloria Lines	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
192	S52.030	Gloria Lines	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
193	S52.032	Gloria Lines	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
194	S52.033	Gloria Lines	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
195	S53.003	Barbara-Jean Edwards	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend timeframe for public input by a minimum of another 4 weeks.	Far too much information for the average resident to understand and digest, within the current timeframe.	Reject	Section 13
196	S53.006	Barbara-Jean Edwards	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Ensure that a minimum area of non-residential-building land (i.e. for parking, laneways, access) is protected from development for buildings, to allow for climate change such as water runoff, shading, sunlight; the minimum to be agreed on by Nelson residents submissions.	We must take future climate change into consideration; the effects of climate change and the need for our adaptation, are becoming subjects needing much more careful thought and planning.	Reject	Section 13
197	S53.007	Barbara-Jean Edwards	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Clearly share any analytical data with residents, on which both the scope of Plan 29 and also the designated areas have been decided.	Not enough analytical detail released to the public. And reference to OECD analysis is redundant as 35 countries are members of OECD, so generalisations used with respect to Plan 29 are useless and are possibly misinformation.	Reject	Section 10
198	S54.009	Pauline Warne	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Reject Plan Change 29 [but in the alternative make the changes set out in the submiission].	Refer to reasons in submission points S54.002 - S54.008.	Reject	Section 9

199	S55.001	Simon Harbinson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Do not allow] 6 storey houses in my area without planning consent.	Key reasons include: - Too many people for the local school - Drainage and sewerage - Slips - Amenities - Parking - Infrastructure - Has this been properly thought through - Feels like this is being slipped in the back door way too fast and without proper debate. Other reasons include: - 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. The documents available online are not easy to follow and the consultation time is short given the impact of the changes. In addition there are inconsistencies between what has previously been proposed for the future growth and development of Nelson and what is being proposed in PC29. - Impact on amenity values 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. 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. it could result in a very uneven looking neighbourhood, with apartments facing into neighbouring yards for some distance around, while the remainder are unaffected. It results in a lottery effect on amenity. These types of high rise developments may also be more likely to attract absentee owners and a poliferation of Air BnB type accomodation which will also negatively impact on the existing residents. -	Reject	Section 12
200	FS33.002	Stephen Fitchett		Support	Accept	Lack of consultation given the range and complexities of the changes. I attended the Trafalgar Centre meeting but the soundproofing requirements for alterations to houses within 100 metres of State Highway 6 have received little (no??) publicity. Given the highway runs right through Nelson this clause will affect a great number of residents.	Reject	Section 13
201	S60.001	Dan McGuire	Mapping	Oppose	[Exclude] all of Domett St. from the high density [residential zone]. [Seeks] Council rezone the block of Domett Street/ Hardy Street/ Tasman Street and Nile Street from Plan [Change] 29 High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), [to] be the same classification as the other half of Domett Street/ Bridge Street block, or The Wood area of Residential - Comprehensive Area/ Residential Lower Density Area	Domett St. is subject to flooding. For consistency, ALL of Domett St. should be excluded from high density. Only the lower half was excluded, although we had flooding on the upper half last August 2022. This area should be [rezoned] due to the potential flooding from the Maitai River and Brook Stream. This area should also be [rezoned] because the fault line is going through the middle of the block together with the whole block being in a liquefaction zone.	Accept in part	Section 12
202	S60.002	Dan McGuire	Entire Plan Change	Amend	The hearing Board should be independent of Councillors and Council staff. Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Councillors and Council staff have already shown clear bias for this plan to go through, in its current form, as it is seen as a conflict of interest and completely loses credibility with the wider community. The Hearing Board should be independent of Councillors and Council staff. Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13

203	S60.005	Dan McGuire	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Local plans should concentrate density directly along transportationcorridors and around employment centers, and then gradually step it back intosurrounding neighborhoods.	California has already been through almost precisely the process that Nelson is now planning. The Plan would mean that residential areas would have their rates escalate exponentially because of the sudden huge increase in land value. Current residents would be forced out of their homes. The community that exists in many neighbourhoods would be destroyed. By approving Plan Change 29, you would be hitting a tack with a sledgehammer. The current processes allow for urban infill on a step-by-step basis, with consideration for the interests of all residents. Plan Change 29 would destroy the social fabric in residential Nelson. Refer to original submission and the article attached for more detail.	Reject	Section 9
204	S60.006	Dan McGuire	Infrastructure	Oppose	Upgraded neighborhood infrastructure must precede any appreciable increase in residents.	Refer to reasons in submission point S60.005.	Reject	Section 11
205	S60.007	Dan McGuire	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Climate resiliency should be advanced through reduced paving and increased tree cover.	Refer to reasons in submission point S60.005.	Reject	Section 13
206	S60.008	Dan McGuire	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Measures such as flexible zoning and design standards, leasing of surplus public land and down-payment assistance can aid in making new housing affordable.	Refer to reasons in submission point S60.005.	Accept in part	Section 12
207	S60.009	Dan McGuire	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Enforcing state requirements for local fair-share allocation of new housing will ensure all jurisdictions do their part.	Refer to reasons in submission point S60.005.	Reject	Section 13
208	S60.010	Dan McGuire	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Impacted neighborhoods need to be engaged more effectively in the planning process if they are to accept, even support, gradual transformation.	Refer to reasons in submission point S60.005.	Reject	Section 13
209	S60.011	Dan McGuire	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	Refer to reasons in submission point S60.012.	Reject	Section 13
210	S60.012	Dan McGuire	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
211	S60.013	Dan McGuire	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
212	S60.015	Dan McGuire	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S60.014.	Reject	Section 13
213	S60.019	Dan McGuire	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12

214	S60.020	Dan McGuire	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 12
215	FS28.005	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 in part	Section 12
216	S60.022	Dan McGuire	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
217	S60.027	Dan McGuire	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S60.020 and S60.014.	Reject	Section 13
218	S60.028	Dan McGuire	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
219	S60.035	Dan McGuire	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
220	S60.037	Dan McGuire	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
221	S60.038	Dan McGuire	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
222	S60.044	Dan McGuire	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S60.019 and S60.039 above.	Accept in part	Section 12

223	S60.045	Dan McGuire	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S60.001 and S60.043 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
224	S62.001	Beverly Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S62.002 and the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 9
225	S62.002	Beverly Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
226	S62.003	Beverly Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote; or alternatively the Hearings Panel should have at least four and preferably five members with a quorum of three, and no more than one elected member.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting. Because there will be many submissions, it is likely that the elected members on the panel may know submitters personally, creating potential for conflicts of interest and a need to withdraw from the hearings on that matter. it is much more important that the Commissioners have the training and experience to engage with technical experts and understand and apply technical expert considerations and evidence on technical subjects, including in this case traffic and geotechnical engineering. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
227	S62.005	Beverly Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Request] that the Council will prioritise housing growth and intensification within the inner city before the current residential zones.	I believe the Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoos. This can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods.	Reject	Section 10
228	S62.006	Beverly Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
229	S62.007	Beverly Sellers	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
230	S62.009	Beverly Sellers	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

231	S62.011	Beverly Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Request] that an urban development agency or robust urban design panel be established to consider the overall vision and design of any intensification plans.	It is essential that strong qualitative, not just quantitative, standards be put in place. We need such quality controls in place to ensure good quality design for the city. It should not be left to developers on a citywide or areawide basis. Whilst there is a need to intensify and add vibrancy to Nelson, the process is not right. Strategy has been missed from the process. Planning is not one size fits all. When change happens in a good, positive, inclusive way, the outcome is far better. Finally, with a nod to the city's important history, an information board at the Cathedral notes that the wife of Whakatu Nelson's first Bishop did not find 'the settlers of Nelson proud of their picturesque advantages'. I think that has changed over the years, and we should make sure we can remain proud of those picturesque advantages now and into the future.	Accept	Section 13
232	S62.014	Beverly Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Request Council] gives a further notice to extend the closing date for submissions, with far greater open communication to the Nelson public about the proposed Plan Change.	I acknowledge that in the given timeframe I have found it extremely difficult to digest the whole effect of the proposed PC29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
233	S62.015	Beverly Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Negotiate and/or incentivise Industry and car yards [in the city centre and fringe] to relocate, to less essential land.	So that the existing car yard sites can be redeveloped for housing. There would appear to be several vacant plots of land in the inner city, which would seem ideal for residential development. I am not aware who owns these parcels of land, but I feel they would be more appropriate for residential development than the Whakatu Nelson suburbs.	Reject	Section 10
234	S62.016	Beverly Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Propose] we should be looking at the vision for specific neighbourhoods and what we want for them-- thinking through the impacts to the neighbours and the street.	Robust design input will ensure there is diversity in housing typology that works in harmony with existing properties.	Accept	Section 13
235	S62.017	Beverly Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Request] when planning for intensification that Nelson City Council takes into account the justified concerns of existing residents.	Consideration of Existing Residents Community engagement sessions on PC 29 were only arranged by Nelson City Council after some dedicated local residents worked extremely hard to ensure others were aware of PC 29 and its implications. I was struck by the stress, anger and anxiety that existing residents feel about the proposals at the sessions | attended. Not enough consideration has been given to the people who already live in Whakatu Nelson, whether for many years or as newcomers. These are people who love the city and have chosen to live here but suddenly feel their properties could at any point and with no notification, lose their daylight, privacy, comfort, quiet and outlook, not to mention value. The uncertainty is extremely stressful to live with. The reality would be worse.	Reject	Section 13
236	S62.020	Beverly Sellers	Mapping	Oppose	Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district.	AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules will apply to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Reject	Section 12
237	FS28.006	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 in part	Section 12

238	S63.003	Vivian Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
239	S63.004	Vivian Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote; or alternatively an independent panel.	I strongly disagree with the make-up of the hearing panel, because of its 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
240	FS31.014	Stephen Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
241	FS72.014	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
242	FS66.016	Carol Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
243	FS61.014	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
244	FS76.014	Robert Stevenson(1)		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
245	FS54.014	Nicole Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
246	FS53.014	Susan Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
247	FS46.014	Dan McGuire		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
248	FS77.014	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
249	FS58.014	Robert Stevenson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
250	FS60.014	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
251	S63.005	Vivian Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Request Council] gives a further notice to extend the closing date for submissions, with far greater open communication to the Nelson public about the proposed Plan Change.	I acknowledge that in the given timeframe I have found it extremely difficult to digest the whole effect of the proposed PC29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13

252	S63.007	Vivian Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
253	S63.008	Vivian Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
254	S63.010	Vivian Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S63.009.	Reject	Section 13
255	S63.013	Vivian Sellers	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
256	S63.015	Vivian Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
257	S63.017	Vivian Sellers	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 12
258	FS28.007	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 in part	Section 12
259	S63.020	Vivian Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S63.009 and S63.017.	Reject	Section 13
260	S63.022	Vivian Sellers	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

261	S63.023	Vivian Sellers	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
262	S63.024	Vivian Sellers	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
263	S64.001	Kent Chamberlain	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support plan change 29 in full.	As Nelson is heavily constrained with suitable land to expand on, the only solution is to build up on land that's better future proofed. Having more people living closer to the center of town and facilities is also a good thing as it reduces infrastructure required. This plan change will help Nelson become a 15 minute city. Making the process easier for development will enable faster building and hopefully cheaper too.	Accept	Section 9
264	S65.001	Jean-Luc Azzis	Entire Plan Change	Support	Fuly Support the plan to intensify housing in urban Nelson.	The city centre would benefit greatly from having more resident to support businesses throughout the year. The intensification would help with climate change initiative by reducing the number of commuters to the centre. The social life of the city centre would get a boost from more residents in the city.	Support in part	Section 9
265	S72.001	Charles Rands	Mapping	Oppose in part	[Oppose] the high-density areas in the Tahunanui Hills between Tosswill Road and Tamaki Street.	The hillside has stability issues and putting larger buildings will add to the risk in the areas. There will be greater than 6-story effects for shade for houses downhill of any 6-story development because the buildings will be on a slope. The darkness in winter will be substantial for houses downhill and south of the 6-story development. The stormwater is already not coping with the current amount of density. Sewage will need to be upgraded substantially. The area has little amenities to support this level of density. For example, there is not even a supermarket in Tahunanui. This area is completely inappropriate for 6-story residential development.	Accept	Section 12
266	FS61.063	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- [Oppose] the high-density areas in the Tahunanui Hills between Tosswill Road and Tamaki Street. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- This area is completely inappropriate for HDZ.	Accept in part	Section 12
267	FS72.067	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- [Oppose] the high-density areas in the Tahunanui Hills between Tosswill Road and Tamaki Street. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- This area is completely inappropriate for HDZ.	Accept in part	Section 12
268	FS60.059	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- [Oppose] the high-density areas in the Tahunanui Hills between Tosswill Road and Tamaki Street. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- This area is completely inappropriate for HDZ.	Accept in part	Section 12
269	S73.001	Sally Gepp	Heritage	Oppose in part	Undertake an assessment of special character and amend PC29 to ensure areas with special character are not zoned at an intensity that will diminish that character.	NCC is proposing to apply a high density residential zone in areas that have significant special character and heritage values around the Tasman St/Erin St/Brookside area. That zoning is not necessary to achieve the housing capacity objectives of the NPSUD, will not maintain the existing values that give Nelson its special character, and will not protect the heritage value of these places.	Accept in part	Section 12

270	FS65.031	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: Undertake an assessment of special character and amend PC29 to ensure areas with special character are not zoned at an intensity that will diminish that character. 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 in part	Section 12
271	FS78.058	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Undertake an assessment of special character and amend PC29 to ensure areas with special character are not zoned at an intensity that will diminish that character. 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 in part	Section 12
272	S73.004	Sally Gepp	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Amend all zoning provisions to require retention of net vegetated cover and notable trees when undertaking subdivision or building structures.	Urban vegetation/trees are essential for mitigating and coping with climate change, for providing for people's connection with nature, and for biodiversity. Intensification should not be at the cost of losing urban trees.	Reject	Section 11
273	S74.001	Paul Davison	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw plan change 29.	Not appropriate for Stoke residential areas.	Reject	Section 9
274	S74.002	Paul Davison	Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove this zone from plan change 29.	Not appropriate for this Stoke residential area.	Reject	Section 9
275	S75.001	Eliot Sinclair and Partners Ltd	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Support Plan Change 29 subject to the amendments set out in the submission.	This submission seeks to voice the Submitter's general support and where changes are proposed; opposition to specific provisions within Plan Change 29.	Reject	Section 9
276	S76.001	Tamatea Easton	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support this plan to allow housing intensification in Nelson.	Housing intensification is required to support a growing population, improve housing affordability & slow the spread of housing across fertile farmland. I support Plan Change 29, even though I live in a proposed medium-density area & have neighbouring properties planned for intensification.	Accept	Section 9
277	S77.001	Tracy Manning	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 S77.008. Solar units will no longer function and loss of privacy and a loss of value and standard of living for too many people.	Accept in part	Section 12
278	S77.004	Tracy Manning	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S77.001 and S77.008.	Accept in part	Section 12
279	S77.005	Tracy Manning	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
280	S77.006	Tracy Manning	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the Closing Date for Submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
281	S77.007	Tracy Manning	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Better use of land in the Brook and Maitai areas.	Subdivisions and housing are way more important than the pines are. The not in my back yard mentality of not building in these areas is not as important to protecting current standards of living in already built up places.	Reject	Section 13

282	S78.001	Jaimie Barber	Residential Zones	Support in part	Reduce the area of the High Density zone to a more concentrated area - CBD and CBD fringe only.	I support a high density zone but it should be reduced in size and highly concentrated to avoid ruining the character of city fringe neighbourhoods. The jump from single storey to 6 storey is too much and scattered developments over a wider area will detract from the character of city fringe neighborhoods. 6 stories is an is an experiment for Nelson so let's keep the experiment in to a confined area. The loss in dwelling volumes due to a decrease in the size of the high density zone can be made up by an increase in Medium Density zones along main arterial routes (to support viability and improvement of public transport). I support 6 stories in the CBD and fringe because: 1. developments are more likely to be feasible due to additional sales income from upper levels 2. it will increase vibrancy in inner Nelson, attract younger people to our city and help support viability of CBD businesses, 3. It will reduce development pressure on our sensitive greenfield areas such as the Maitai Valley, and 4. Will reduce traffic emissions and congestion (providing it saves on equivalent greenfield development).	Accept in part	Section 12
283	S78.002	Jaimie Barber	Residential Zones	Support in part	Increase Medium Density Residential Zone areas by applying to main arterial routes such as Waimea Road, Main Road Stoke, Tahunanui Road etc and to all hillsides (apart from Tier 1 slope instability areas).	Medium density along the main arterials will support viability and improvement of public transport. It appears the zone has been applied on the basis of walking distance only and does not factor in public transport at all (present day or future improvements). Hillsides should be Medium Density by default. I see no reason other than stability (which can be managed through engineering) as to why you would differentiate between the easier contour areas. This is a massive missed opportunity for more density in central Nelson, probably at the expense of developing sensitive greenfield areas and a loss in population to Tasman District. Look to Asia if you think it can't be done.	Reject	Section 12
284	FS52.001	David Mountfort		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The Particular Part of the submission I oppose: I oppose the suggestion in the submission that hillsides should be medium density residential by default unless only for reasons of instability. There are other reasons why hillsides may be unsuitable for intensification. Many of the hillside residential areas in Nelson are old suburbs with narrow, sometimes winding roads, often with only a single traffic lane, restricted visibility, inadequate or no footpaths, poor, insufficient or no on street parking and difficult access out onto the main roads. Some hillsides are very steep and vehicle access onto sites would be necessary but very difficult to provide. Problems may also arise with the adequacy of or access to other infrastructure, particularly sewers and stormwater. Upgrading of these streets, particularly widening would often be difficult or impossible due to topography. Although the legal road width may appear to be sufficient, the unformed verges are generally steep and many would require extensive cuts, filling and retaining walls, which would either block or over steepen existing accesses. Redevelopment to medium density residential would almost inevitably be on a site by site basis, while upgrading of the streets and their infrastructure would need to be comprehensive if it was possible at all. Refer also to the reasons outlined in my submission S284.	Accept in part	Section 12

285	S79.001	Christine Curnow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw Plan Change 29.	The creation of High-density Residential zones would have major impact on: 1) the character of the city with multi story buildings destroying the skyline such as Aon House does. 2) existing limited infrastructure - drains even on the hill cannot cope with stormwater. 3) neighbouring properties due to loss of sunlight, noise, rubbish disposal, car parking. Nelson was established on a swamp with much reclaimed land. All new developments in the HDZ require major excavation of soil before hard fill is achieved. This is necessary across all of the HDZ with a hard filled platform needing to be substantially larger than the new developments footprint.	Reject	Section 9
286	S80.001	Emma-Joy Andrews	Entire Plan Change	Support	Approve Plan Change 29.	Nelson needs to look to the future and be able to provide housing for a growing population, without relying overly on sprawl into the countryside.	Accept	Section 9
287	S82.001	Annette (Nettie) Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC 29 in its entirety and make a fresh start.	I reject PC 29 in its entirety. My research supports the notion that Intensification is a worthy and necessary need, but the process and proposals of PC29 are sufficiently deficient to warrant a new start. A rejig of the proposal has been suggested. If this is sufficiently comprehensive to achieve what my submission will cover, I would support that, but believe it needs a fresh start. Have we conducted the process as well as we could have, or in a way that fulfills legislative requirements? Does PC29 deliver the high standard and design expertise demanded of intensification or urban design of a quality that Nelson deserves and is capable of providing? If there is doubt of this, we need to forget any previous positions, whether considered entrenched or not, to resubmit the entire proposal or drop it altogether. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
288	FS83.285	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 10
289	S82.002	Annette (Nettie) Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prepare a draft version of a revised plan to be expressed in plain language.	The proposed PC 29, with the supporting documentation demanded of a legal document, is so complex, detailed, lengthy and inaccessible for many, that it is unreasonable to expect most citizens to have the ability, stamina, or confidence to digest, analyse and make meaningful comments on the contents, in the available time.	Reject	Section 9
290	FS83.286	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 10
291	S82.003	Annette (Nettie) Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Undertake] a broad-based community consultation process completed before technical details of a formal proposal are considered.	Refer to reasons in submission point S82.002. The council's decision not to have conducted direct community consultation or a Social Impact Assessment prior to the formation of PC29 is a travesty. For many living in proposed residential High-Density zones, to have all rights of prior notice or ability to question or challenge a six- story building on their boundary, is an abomination. PC29 threatens their quality of life and calls into question the right of elected members to so drastically smash all reasonable expectations of sun-shine, control, enjoyment of amenities and character of their environs. The potential for harm far outweighs any possible gains of the policy. Any automatic right of Medium-Density or High-density zones in residential areas, prior to a comprehensive definition of 'environment' and 'community' and consultation being applied, is unacceptable. Following the public concern would a majority in council agree? The risk of the council's approach to PC29 is losing the trust and confidence of citizens as to the need for intensification. This will hinder taking the necessary steps that we as a city need to make to improve our planning laws and create quality urban design. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
292	FS83.287	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 10

293	S82.004	Annette (Nettie) Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Form an Urban Design Agency. [Building on submission points S82.002 and S82.003] this draft will need to be informed by a regional Urban Development Agency, formed to be a permanent advisory and facilitating body of local experts in the field of urban development.	Refer to reasons in submission point S82.002. Designing comprehensive neighbourhood plans will be needed to outline the specific design goals for different areas. Robust consultation, seeking a shared vision, and recognition of the need for a regional urban development agency to provide guidance and oversee developments to bring certainty about future buildings, outlook and privacy. This is where an Urban Development Agency will be a critical part of the solution and would be a pre-requisite and permanent feature of our planning regulations. Only then can issues of intensification, such as recession planes and shading effects; privacy and outlook; hazard zones; on-street carparking; social housing; be refined and finalised. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 13
294	FS83.288	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 10
295	S82.005	Annette (Nettie) Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Provide a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports.	It is unacceptable that there was no provision for a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports for residents who do not have access to, or the ability or access to use a computer. The Local Government Act states (LGA ref. 82 Principles of consultation. "1) local authorities must abide by the following principles: (a) that persons who will or may be affected by, or have an interest in, the decision or matter should be provided by the local authority with reasonable access to relevant information in a manner and format that is appropriates to the preferences and needs of those persons."	Reject	Section 9
296	FS83.289	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 10
297	S82.006	Annette (Nettie) Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	A Social Impact Assessment (SIA) needs to be part of a comprehensive community consultation process, as an essential component of a plan change draft. Only then could a final proposal be created before being publicly notified.	The Council needs to answer the question: Have the RMA requirements regarding community consultation been met? For this concerned citizen they clearly have not been met. The Council needs to answer the question: Have these requirements under the LGA been satisfied? For this concerned citizen they clearly have not been met. A comprehensive community consultation process, including a Social Impact Assessment to analyse possible effects on individuals, groups and communities, was not conducted. It would provide the quantitative and qualitative data that a comprehensive community consultation process demands. [Refer to section 3 in the original submission for more detail] The council's decision not to have conducted direct community consultation or a Social Impact Assessment prior to the formation of PC29 is a travesty. For many living in proposed residential High-Density zones, to have all rights of prior notice or ability to question or challenge a six- story building on their boundary, is an abomination. PC29 threatens their quality of life and calls into question the right of elected members to so drastically smash all reasonable expectations of sun-shine, control, enjoyment of amenities and character of their environs. The potential for harm far outweighs any possible gains of the policy. Any automatic right of Medium-Density or High-density zones in residential areas, prior to a comprehensive definition of 'environment' and 'community' and consultation being applied, is unacceptable. Following the public concern would a majority in council agree?	Reject	Section 13
298	FS83.290	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 10

299	S82.007	Annette (Nettie) Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	PC29 should reference and be informed by previous studies and available material.[inferred].	My concern is not only the lack of any direct community consultation for PC29 but also Council's lack of reference to previous studies and available material, that was not acknowledged or did not appear to inform the present proposals. The present council staff and councillors need to refer to the SIA that was carried out for NCC in 2010; 'Report on Change to Arterial Roading.' It is a mystery why Council also failed to incorporate or acknowledge the advice of the Nelson Richmond Intensification Study Stage 1 - Pathways, prepared for: Nelson City Council & Tasman District Council: Boffa Miskell Limited, Jerram Tocker Barron Architects Limited, dated September 2007, but still highly relevant. Mentioned briefly in the supporting evidence for the PC29 was the survey, Nelson-Tasman 'Housing We'd Choose,' Housing Demand Preferences, June 2021. Another notable absence was the Urban Design Agency request put to Council in 2021 as one of a range of options to increase the supply of affordable housing within the region. The option was not adopted by Council due to their perceived costs, or included in any analysis of the issues, that I could find. I support the proposal as detailed in the nelsontasman2050.org.nz correspondence with council, requesting it reconsiders its earlier rejection of such a report. Any submission that supports the forming and active participation of such an UDA has my full endorsement. Cost accrued by establishing and maintaining a UDA needs to be compared to the costs of a failed process, or outcomes of a suboptimum planning change. These will not only be financial. Were these available studies used to inform the proposed PC29, and if so, why was the wisdom or advise not addressed or included in PC29? If they were not part of the Council's investigation	Accept in part	Section 12
300	FS83.291	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 10
301	S82.008	Annette (Nettie) Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incorporate a design-led approach to urban planning.	My own research has shown evidence of the wisdom of incorporating a design-led approach to urban planning. It also provided evidence that there are many in the community who welcomed higher density and apartment style living options, and a general recognition of the need for intensification and the possibility of changing residential styles becoming normalised in appropriate locations. It also found, promoting developer-driven developments was counter-productive, with the reality being that profits will trump better design and sensitivity to amenity values every time. Our 'Leaky Home Syndrome' is more than a distant nightmare. We need to be mindful of past mistakes. Ask ourselves, has the 'market' delivered good housing supply, social housing or sustainable, affordable good urban design in New Zealand over recent decades? No, it has not. To perpetuate this system, by encouraging the same, is not tenable. I request that the council addresses this question fully. We need to encourage the need for intensification, and provide evidence of alternatives and design led solutions. Blunt instruments of allowing multi-story buildings that might fit a few criteria, to appear by chance and at the whim of developers and their investor clientele, is not a solution. My research, evidence of the past decades and commentary from urban design experts will attest to the fact that the 'market' without clear design guides and qualitative controls to ensure good-quality outcomes, will never adequately supply housing solutions for all. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 13
302	FS83.292	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 10

303	S82.011	Annette (Nettie) Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reverse the decision to NOT take the mayor's advice to undertake pre-notification community consultation.	My concerns over the unsuccessful attempt to halt the process, are shared by many. [Refer to section 7(a) in the original submission for more detail] It is my contention that, with the facts of a faulty process, the evidence proves they were wrong to NOT take the mayor's advice, and this decision needs to be reversed.	Reject	Section 13
304	FS83.293	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 10
305	S82.012	Annette (Nettie) Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reconsider the decision to keep this advice secret and release the legal advice that was given.	My attempt, made under the auspices of the Official Information Act, to understand the legal advice that was given to councillors in an in-committee meeting, prior to the vote being taken to halt the process, was twice denied. [Refer to section 7(b) in the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
306	FS83.294	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 10
307	S82.013	Annette (Nettie) Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Provide NCC's definition of 'community' and 'environment' to justify the application of high-density developments in residential zones. Council needs to provide the information concerning what are the adverse effects they have documented regarding High-Density developments and how do they plan to mitigate these.	NCC, as it introduces PC29, needs to provide their definition of 'community' and 'environment' as these changes have been justified "...to continue to meet the needs of the community whilst allowing development and safeguarding our environment" Medium or high-density developments, require a much greater level of expertise, than the one-size-fits-all planning approach. However, PC29 High-Density Zone description makes an economic criterion for high-density development the over-riding planning consideration. This contradicts applying a comprehensive definition of 'community' and 'environment', found in both the RMA and the LGA legislation, which requires a close consideration of, and respect for, the rights and preferences of the most affected residents. Supporting documentation from Barker & Associates Limited Date: 15 March 2023 Re: Plan Change 29, found '.... the cost of construction greater than three storeys in New Zealand increases significantly.... [making] a higher permitted building height would be appropriate.... addressing any adverse effects... depends on the quality of planning and design provisions.' [Refer to section 8 in the original original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
308	FS83.295	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 10
309	S82.014	Annette (Nettie) Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Provide further evidence [regarding the population forecast projections used]. [Request] Dr Geoffrey Hayes submission advice is incorporated into a revised version of PC29.	Councils need to show an acute need to allow Medium Density zone changes for Tier Two cities. High Density housing for Tier Two cities is never given as a possibility in residential zones. (RMA Amendment (Housing and Other matters) Act 2021). It is unclear to what extent Nelson's surprising inclusion of High-Density zone changes alters this equation of population forecasts / acute housing need. However, The Future Development Strategy, that originally informed the council's PC29, did not include High-Density in Residential zones, and even then, they estimated with the changes that they were recommending would provide capacity for about 25,000 houses over the next 30 years in the combined urban environment. The Population and Household Projections for 2018 - 2048 projected an increase that was gradually slowing to project an increase of 6800 by 2048. As a concerned citizen I cannot see the evidence to justify the radical intensification policy of PC29. It appears the forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, and are over-inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ. Refer to original submission, section 9, for more detail.	Reject	Section 12
310	FS83.296	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 10

311	S82.015	Annette (Nettie) Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Develop comprehensive neighbourhood plans [inferred].	The recent meeting, held by concerned citizens and urban design experts at Fairfield House, to discuss possibilities provided a range of alternatives from better land utilisation and provision for secondary minor dwellings, design-led intensified housing that also protected heritage amenities, design standards that upheld street character, soft-landscaping and resident access, and design-led solutions not developer-led solutions. Designing comprehensive neighbourhood plans will be needed to outline the specific design goals for different areas. Refer to original submission, section 10 for more detail.	Reject	Section 13
312	FS65.034	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Develop comprehensive neighbourhood plans [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 13
313	FS78.014	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Develop comprehensive neighbourhood plans [inferred]. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13
314	FS83.297	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 10
315	S82.020	Annette (Nettie) Barrow	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Shared land and facilities could be incorporated, and in more rural areas cluster developments of smaller houses strategical placed for privacy on larger blocks with the land shared and managed communally, would be an option.	Not stated.	Accept in part	Section 13
316	FS83.302	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 10
317	S82.022	Annette (Nettie) Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	We need a seamless integration of Community Housing Providers and Kāinga Ora developments forming mixed housing complexes with shared open green spaces, cycling and walking tracks with vehicles restricted to the perimeters of buildings, with a UDA over-sight of projects in a transparent and open atmosphere.	We are a diverse society and we need our urban design to reflect this. Social housing and affordable housing needs planning and intervention.	Reject	Section 13
318	FS83.304	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 10
319	S82.024	Annette (Nettie) Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	We need compact centres interspersed with green areas, pedestrian friendly streets, shared spaces to provide that sense of community and connectedness, also privacy, and for those not in a position to own their own place we need a greater security of tenure.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 10
320	FS83.306	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 10
320	FS83.306	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 12

321	S83.001	Rob Greenaway	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Provide for only medium-term housing demand during this 'interim' period, considering likely uptake inthe Inner City Zone.	The s32 report refers to a Demand and Capacity Analysis carried out by Market Economics (ME) to identify demand for additional dwellings in Nelson (section 11.2 of the s32 report). This refers to short, medium and long-term demand projections... PC29 appears to be aiming to provide for demand up to 2051 (the long term), which is inappropriate for an 'interim' plan, and one relying on liberal permitted and restricted discretionary rules, and predating review of the RPS or the implementation of any of the necessary neighbourhood or structure planning. At best, PC29 should aim at providing for medium-term demand. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
322	FS39.011	Richard Harden and Rachel Reese		Support	Accept	This submission point highlights the inconsistency of NCCs approach. PC29 goes well beyond an interim plan change. It is comprehensive plan change that required a much stronger evidence base and much greater community engagement, and subsequent refinement, before notification.	Reject	Section 9
323	S83.008	Rob Greenaway	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Undertake neighboourhood planning].	In my opinion, the liberal use of permitted and restricted discretionary activity status for many proposed new activities in the proposed Residential zones exists in opposition to the intent of the FDS, particularly its expectation for neighbourhood planning to occur either before or after new intensification zones are identified. The rules proposed for the Residential zones will occur in a community-planning vacuum and likely lead to significant adverse cumulative effects on community amenity. The proposed changes to the Urban Design chapter in the NRMP, appear to weaken Council's role in urban design. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
324	FS39.012	Richard Harden and Rachel Reese		Support	Accept	We agree with these submission points.	Accept in part	Section 9
325	FS65.036	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Incompatible with FDS - [Undertake neighbourhood planning]. 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 13
326	FS78.015	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Incompatible with FDS - [Undertake neighbourhood planning]. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Accept in part	Section 12
327	S83.009	Rob Greenaway	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Review and update the Regional Policy Statement].	Appendix 1B of the s32 report provides an analysis of the alignment between the RPS and PC29 and suggests that the RPS does not require amendment. Appendix 1B appears to rely on the RPS's lack of reference to managing intensification as its justification for avoiding its review, rather than identifying that the RPS lacks the guidance that is required. Relying on a lack of guidance in antecedent policy to provide an opportunity for a development proposal is more the style of a consent application than a good method for developing sound long-term planning policy. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
328	FS39.010	Richard Harden and Rachel Reese		Support	Accept	NCC should not be undertaking a Plan Change of this scale without reviewing and updating the RPS.	Reject	Section 9
329	S84.001	Denis Digges La Touche	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Cancel Plan Change 29 and start again.	I am totally opposed to the broadbrush approach to intensification in PC29 in Nelson. The idea of six-storey appartments being built in single storey residential areas is plain wrong. And the vision of Nelson residential areas over time becoming a mass of high rises is abhorent. It's certainly not the Nelson I want to live in. PC29 does not obey the Law of Primacy which says that the existing residents have all the rights, to live here in peace and tranquility.	Reject	Section 9

330	S84.002	Denis Digges La Touche	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Work with neighborhood groups to determine where high density intensification actually works within the neighbourhood.	I am not anti-intensification. I am for intensification by design - using design principals which take into account what actually works in each neighbourhood, guarantees respect of existing sunlight/daylight rules, residents' privacy, natural hazards, requires at least 1 on-site car park space for each home unit/appartment, space for social housing and infrastructure needs.	Reject	Section 13
331	S85.002	Alison Oertly	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Buildings higher than 3 storeys be concentrated in the area within the CBD boundaries - broadly, Collingwood Street, Halifax Street, St Vincent Street and Selwyn Place - giving residents in those properties access to all city amenities. The ground floor space could be used for commercial/retail purposes with apartments on the floors above, as is common in many cities overseas.	Refer to reasons in submission point S85.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
332	FS83.027	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
333	S85.006	Alison Oertly	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Future building developments must be well thought- through and planned with Council oversight so as to enhance the overall beauty of our city and not merely to serve the individual interests of developers and investors.	Refer to reasons in submission point S85.001.	Reject	Section 13
334	FS83.031	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
335	S86.003	Hazel Thelin	Infrastructure	Amend	Upgrade infrastructure for sewerage and stormwater prior to rezoning for increased density [inferred].	Any areas re-zoned to have sewerage and stormwater upgrades undertaken prior to re-zoning to accommodate the zoned density development.	Reject	Section 10
336	S86.005	Hazel Thelin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
337	S86.007	Hazel Thelin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission point S86.001 and S86.008.	Accept in part	Section 12
338	FS5.006	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 9

339	S86.008	Hazel Thelin	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose any high density zoning within existing residential zoned areas in the Nelson Region.	High Density Re-Zoning within existing residential zones is not required for the numbers of population and population projections in future and from the numbers of people projected in the next 50 years of moving inland from any sea or river inundation areas or from rehousing from instability zones. An Increase in High density zoning and creating high density areas in existing residentially zones areas for this City isolated at the top of the south island is not compatible with residents existing culture and amenity of the existing city and outlying region and is too profound a change for existing residents who have chosen to live or stay living and have invested in housing in this region. High density rezoning is incompatible with the existing infrastructure. Changing any residential zone to high density is too profound a change and would seriously affect culture, amenity, annual sunlight penetrating into existing residences, awareness of outside from existing residences, reduce natural daylight penetrating existing residences and provide a higher density of people, lack of privacy within existing residences and creating more congested roading, access and amenity issues, road safety issues, and child safety issues (especially around school zones).	Accept	Section 12
340	S86.014	Hazel Thelin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
341	S87.001	Jane Horder	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support Plan Change 29.	This plan appears to manage increasing population over the next 30yrs with significant research and detail gone in to the options (see section 32 evaluation report). Intensification provides more housing, (with less people pushed onto productive horticultural land), and encourages people living closer to amenities. As long as the plan change protects historic heritage and manages natural hazard risks.	Support in part	Section 9
342	S88.001	Jacquetta Bell	Mapping	Oppose in part	Revise the proposed areas where three & six story apartments would be allowed.	I support intensification of housing, but this sweeping change which removes the right of neighbours to object to life changing developments goes too far. Moving east from the city, Tasman Street is a more natural boundary for High Density, than Harper St where the boundary is now. Just on parking - Harper St cannot currently cope with residents parking, plus overflow from Te Pukenga (NMIT). Harper St has an earthquake overlay which allows only building on current footprint. It is hard to understand why or how the eastern side of the street is now suggested for three story apartments and the west side for six stories. If the areas where three/six stories were allowed were designated with more regard to sunlight angles and lifestyle, in Harper St for example, higher rise buildings could go at the south end of the street when they would have far less impact. Council must not allow Nelson to be ruined by developers motivated only by profit. We have something precious in this city, and can accomodate more people without jeopardising the Nelson lifestyle. Finally I question the growth paradigm which this plan change caters to. The planet is burning and it is time we ceased seeing growth as good thing.	Accept in part	Section 12

343	S89.001	Stephen Mazur	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Cancel the proposed Plan change [and remove the] Medium and High Density Residential Zones.	1. These proposed changes are an obscenity to the people of Nelson. The residential nature, feel and open landscape of our community will be stuffed by up to 6 story monstrosities. Our homes and properties include expansive views of the sky and often across the city to the sea. There is a sense of open spaces, sunlight, privacy, etc. The NCC proposed housing changes will effectively stuff hundreds of properties - either those living nearby and in the shadow of the new towers, and also those who have them in their view from further back. They will be an absolute blight on the cityscape. 2. Each tower will effectively destroy the quality of life and amenity value of properties living in the shadow and sight of these towers.. NO ONE wants a tower next door, especially when sunlight will be blocked.	Accept in part	Section 12
344	S89.002	Stephen Mazur	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Compensate] affected adjacent properties due to the reduction in their property values.	Refer to reasons in submission point S89.001.	Reject	Section 12
345	S90.001	Andrew & Margreet Petheram	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Complete neighbourhood plans prior to proceeding further [and] [undertake] consultation with local communities to identify [important] features as the next stage of moving towards a plan for managed urban intensification.	We oppose the plan in whole prior to the completion of neighbourhood plans as envisaged in the Future Development Strategy. We support the preparation of neighbourhood plans to identify the special character of local areas - topography, views, sunlight, heritage, tree scape, function. We ask that the Council consults with local communities to identify these features as the next stage of moving towards a plan for managed urban intensification. We believe it is necessary to provide higher quality neighbourhood spaces - sunny, accessible, green, family friendly, - catering for closer communities with reduced private sections.	Reject	Section 13
346	S90.002	Andrew & Margreet Petheram	Residential Zones	Oppose	Rezone to [General Residential Zone].	Not stated.	Reject	Section 12
347	S91.003	Caroline Astridge	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Consider the social impacts of housing intensification.	In Britian in the 1960s they built high rise towers for lower socio economic groups to be housed together. These were deemed a complete failure as they became centres of crime. Today they are being torn down, with their populations interspersed within other communities on a scattered basis. Please consider if you are creating future problems by housing certain socio economic groups together with housing intensification.	Reject	Section 13
348	S92.002	Paul Nicholson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Form a Design Standards Commission to create reasonable and realistic design standards and to monitor projects to ensure that they all meet those standards.	Reasonable design standards are necessary to ensure that inappropriate, out-of-scale buildings are not constructed in residential areas.	Reject	Section 13
349	S92.003	Paul Nicholson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Increase the size of the Submissions Review Panel from three (3) to five (5), and include two independent informed/knowledgeable citizens who live outside the areas impacted by the zone changes.	Three panel members is too few to ensure submissions are fairly reviewed, especially when two of the three members have already voted to continue with the Plan as is. The perception of fairness is essential if the ultimate Plan is to be embraced by the general citizenship of Nelson.	Reject	Section 13
350	S92.007	Paul Nicholson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Provide incentives to developers to encourage them to include a certain percentage of affordable housing units in their projects.	Simply building more housing units will not help to make those units affordable.	Reject	Section 13
351	S92.009	Paul Nicholson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Carry out a rigorous review of the process by which the 25 year population projections have been developed, and publish findings; adjust population projections as appropriate.	Among the 10 New Zealand cities that have population between 70,000 and 43,000, Nelson is below the median in population density as well as the number of people on the Housing Register. Perhaps the "crisis" that has informed this extreme plan change is overstated and not based on a realistic assessment of our population needs over the next 25 years. A document outlining the above information is attached.	Reject	Section 10

352	S92.012	Paul Nicholson	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Amend the Plan to specify that the Council will prioritise housing growth and intensification within the inner City before the current residential zones.	Nelson's residential zones are an essential part of the character and soul of the city. Placement of large 3 to 6 story apartment buildings in the residential areas will forever damage and even destroy what makes Nelson special.	Accept in part	Section 13
353	S92.014	Paul Nicholson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Undertake a process that reworks the PC29 process to enable each community to have the opportunity to weigh in on what it sees as its future regarding form and location of new buildings, topography, open space, play areas, traffic flow etc. In other words, design and implement a series of comprehensive neighbourhood plans before developing the rules and assessment criteria that would enable that vision to become a reality.	A broad-brush, one-size-fits-all approach is bound to lead to disappointing results.	Accept in part	Section 12
354	S92.015	Paul Nicholson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Institute a design-led approach (instead of the proposed developer-led one) to ensure there are good-quality design outcomes.	As a community, we need to work collectively with our Council and planners to robustly design the Nelson of the Future, not allow individual developers do it for us.	Accept in part	Section 13
355	S92.016	Paul Nicholson	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Build a revised Plan process that creates new spatial neighbourhood plans for all medium and high density zones.	A great deal of work has gone into creating PC29. But the process was flawed. As a result, the Plan is flawed, and does not take into account the needs and hopes of our current residents.	Reject	Section 9
356	S93.001	Carol McIntosh	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29 to the NRMP.	Nelson should not incorporate these changes to density standards into the NRMP. These standards were created by Central Govt to address density problems in our major tier one cities, principally in Auckland. Nelson being a tier two Local Authority is not required to implement these changes. The future demographics of Nelson indicate that the highest growing population group is likely to be those aged 65 plus and that other age groups are on the decline. The proposed high density high rise housing in the inner city I submit would not be attractive to the 65+ age group. The assumption that high density housing equates to affordability I believe is an unproven concept and we have not been presented with evidence that such housing will result in more affordable properties. There is also the obvious cost to existing properties who would be severely disadvantaged by a high rise being erected next to their properties. The proposed plan changes would give these property owners no right of redress. In relation to the plan changes for the general housing zones which would allow more buildings, built higher and closer to boundaries, I submit that this would decrease the amenity values both to those currently living in these areas and would make these areas less attractive for people to move into. As in the inner city zones, daylight and sunshine are crucial for keeping houses warm, dry and more affordable to heat. The increased shading from increased density would impact this. The proposal to allow for smaller sections would also impact on residents being able to garden and grow their own food, both of which are important contributors to general health and well being. I note that gardening is regularly listed as our number one form of exercise. I submit that it is	Reject	Section 9
357	FS83.032	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12

358	S94.001	William Rush	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delay the decision on the High Density Residential zone until there is a clear requirement for further intensification.	This will allow for work to be done to ascertain where higher density housing can be allowed and still leave existing houses with a reasonable outlook and minimum shading, particularly in winter time. As a Tier 2 local authority, Nelson City Council is not required under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development to enable development of any particular height/number of storeys. It is not clear why the proposed height of 19.5m has been chosen for the new High Density Residential Zone.	Reject	Section 9
359	S94.003	William Rush	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	Change the colours in the plan change maps to make it easier for plan users to determine which zones apply where.	The colours chosen to show the Residential zones in the PC29 maps are very similar and it is difficult to see the difference between the High and Medium Density Residential zones.	Reject	Section 9
360	S94.005	William Rush	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Identify new subdivision areas where they could be designed to have taller buildings on larger sections where there are sufficient spacings so that daylight angles do not have a limited detrimental effect of neighbouring properties.	In to the future, I think that there should be an effort to identify new subdivision areas where they could be designed to have taller buildings on larger sections where there are sufficient spacings so that daylight angles do not have a limited detrimental effect on neighbouring properties. The proposed subdivision up the Maitai could be in this category.	Reject	Section 13
361	S95.001	Hannes Hille	Entire Plan Change	Support	Approve Plan Change 29.	As a young renter in Nelson, I value being able to live close to my workplace in the city centre, and be able to bike to work. With Nelson's increasing population, I worry that I won't be able to do this affordably if we don't increase housing density in the city centre.	Accept	Section 9
362	S96.001	Esther McNaughton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Implement] a staged approach to intensification which is established initially in areas which do not impact on current residential homes, such as the car parks in the centre of the Nelson CBD, or light industrial/ business properties in central Nelson which could be relocated to a more appropriate setting.	I am opposed to the Proposed Plan Change 29 because of the extreme and detrimental effects I believe it will have on existing residential neighborhoods and because I have not seen evidence that this amount of new housing is needed. While I agree that intensification can be a positive strategy with many benefits, the Proposed Plan Change 29 seems ad hoc, and does not have enough checks to ensure that the developments which occur will be beneficial to our city. The plan must meet the needs of the current residents and this plan change will harm the well being of these residents in many ways such as the loss of sunlight, privacy, views, the ability to grow one's own food (since crops can't grow without sunlight). Additionally the plan change does not address parking or noise issues which will no doubt arise from such intensification.	Reject	Section 13
363	S98.001	Diane Raabe	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject Plan Change 29].	I strongly object to plan 29 as Nelson is a low-density city with sunlight and a great standard of living. Why would anyone want to destroy this and bastardize one of the few remaining cities that offer a great life style and good environmental conditions. Intensive building is very environmentally damaging and offers no good quality of life. Please stop stealing our sunshine and our way of life just to benefit developers and greed. There is no infrastructure to support this mad decision, especially not in the Tahunanui Hills, no public transport, no access to shops or doctors surgeries etc. I will sell up and leave if this plan goes ahead.	Reject	Section 11
364	FS72.022	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Nelson is a low-density city with sunlight and a great standard of living. Why would anyone want to destroy this and bastardize one of the few remaining cities that offer a great life style and good environmental conditions.There is no infrastructure to support this mad decision, especially not in the Tahunanui Hills, no public transport, no access to shops or doctors surgeries etc. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support/:- Poor infrastructure and quality of the much loved way we want to live in Nelson.	Accept in part	Section 12

365	FS61.022	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	Nelson is a low-density city with sunlight and a great standard of living. Why would anyone want to destroy this and bastardize one of the few remaining cities that offer a great life style and good environmental conditions There is no infrastructure to support this mad decision, especially not in the Tahunanui Hills, no public transport, no access to shops or doctors surgeries etc. The reasons for my support/:- Poor infrastructure and quality of the much loved way we want to live in Nelson	Reject	Section 11
366	FS60.024	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Nelson is a low-density city with sunlight and a great standard of living. Why would anyone want to destroy this and bastardize one of the few remaining cities that offer a great life style and good environmental conditions. There is no infrastructure to support this mad decision, especially not in the Tahunanui Hills, no public transport, no access to shops or doctors surgeries etc. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support/:- Poor infrastructure and quality of the much loved way we want to live in Nelson.	Accept in part	Section 12
367	S99.001	Wes Dayton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Abandon Plan Change 29, or delay it until there is a clear design developed for the area to be changed.	I believe that the council has clearly "put the cart before the horse" by issuing a series of building rules without providing a "design" that will be used to take Nelson into the future. Without an overall design to guide developers regarding whether they were building residencies, offices, shop or whatever, the inevitable result will be a hotchpotch of buildings without any coherence, let along attraction. I fear that Nelson's lack of any real vision before allowing this new direction for developers will miss a great opportunity to turn Nelson into a South Island centre attractive to a wide range of people and interests.	Reject	Section 13
368	S100.001	Johann Voigtlander	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Oppose the High Density Residential Zone and consider alternatives].	Nelson has always been a little town and I love it the way it is. The council should have SLOWLY been pushing a plan 29 for the last 50 years, slowly putting in 2-3 storey apartments up, not all at once. Being an engineer, my belief is that 3D printed housing technology in 10-20 years' time will drastically reduce the building cost of a home. I would like to see Nelson take the lead in these technologies, bulldoze old homes, and replace them with insulated double-glazed new homes for a fraction of the cost of a traditionally built wood-framed house. This will make it so homes become affordable again and maybe I can have a future here.	Accept in part	Section 12
369	S101.001	Callum Inns	Entire Plan Change	Support	Adopt plan change 29 in its entirety.	We need to allow densification of brownfield sites nearer to places that people work, go to school, shop and partake in society (sport etc.). By allowing people to live where they work/play, it reduces the need to travel long distances. If we instead go with sprawl out towards the North and South of Nelson, people will be required to travel long distances. This will result in increased demand on roads, pathways, PT and parking. Even with EVs, there still will be demand for more parking, there will be pollutants from tyres, noise and safety/amenity impacts of increased traffic. It is unaffordable for council and central government to fund infrastructure across a larger and larger area. It's more cost effective to install large pipes in town than medium pipes for miles out into the south of Richmond for instance. Also, if we go with sprawl, it may require the southern link to be built and as the Environment court explained in their decision, there are many negatives to this. Also, Nelson will be held back from economic growth if we cant affordably house our people, especially young people with talent who may want to move to nelson but dont want to commute. Please do not think the 350 people that showed up to that meeting speak for the rest of us. We're happy with the proposal so arent motivated to attend.	Accept in Part	Section 9

370	S102.001	Zoe Teece	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose Plan Change 29].	I was 25 when i brought my first house in main road stoke. This was years of working while studying, saving instead of going out with friends, making every cent count to get a small house of 104 square meters. This was work and paying a mortgage is work, it's not fun and games, its being boring and choosing a life where i want to get ahead, which won't be until our 30-year mortgage ends and by that time our house will need so much work done that we will be throwing money at that too. Our house backs onto wharema an area which that we are aware is going to be housing for kainga ora. We are also aware people need housing but seeing the state some of these people in kainga ora houses we are very concerned with who we are now going to be surrounded by and with the dream of having a baby we don't want to live next to a range of people who could be bringing a range of issues right in stoke centre. Beyond disappointing of the council to put in these bus systems yet not utilize that by building outwards where it is acceptable. It's a joke to think our schooling system can handle more children that what there already is and with the National party's intent to get rid of the full pay parity you won't be seeing many more teachers coming to join the workforce. This plan is not ok for nelson, and you saw that last night at the meeting, for once listen to what the people are saying and don't pretend you wouldn't be mad if your house value was to drop because of this stupid plan.	Reject	Section 13
371	S104.001	Amelia Pitt	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Revisit Plan Change 29 for amore palatable, re-written version that gives better protection to neighbourssunlight, heritage and areas of character in our City.	After hearing so much unhappiness with many aspects of Plan Change 29, regarding its content, delivery and timeframes then I strongly suggest, in the greater interests of the wider community, that Plan Change 29 be pushed back to the planners, for a more palatable, re-written version that gives better protection to neighbours sunlight, heritage and areas of character in our City. For a few reasons, the 'Plan 29' needs to be revised & looked at again; 1.On seymour avenue... our house is small and under a hillside so we only get half days sun in the summer and winter, which makes it already cold and increases our power bill, if you put more houses around us and other places like us that completely block out the sun we will have no means of warmth and life growing light to say the least! 2.The hillside on Seymour Avenue had some major slips and putting higher buildings next to the hillside would be wrong and dangerous as you would be disturbing the ground and hill to put in foundations for proposed buildings... 3.With the cost of living up, a lot of people are growing what they can at home in their gardens and this requires space & sunlight. Buildings 3-6 storys will not help that and only leave more people hungry and cold. 4.Lack of sunlight drastically effects the moods and moral of people, its widely known. If you put high rise buildings next to small town houses it will cause immese effects on peoples mental health, physical health, work moral and freedom of growth as this will effect gardens and food grown due to lack of sunlight. 5.There are certain places where i can see up to 3 story housing valuable and beneficial but a small heritage area which we work so hard to preserve and restore for future generations of history and heritage is not a place for high story	Reject	Section 12
372	FS65.040	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: Revisit Plan Change 29 for a more palatable, re-written version that gives better protection to neighbours sunlight, heritage and areas of character in our City. 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 in part	Section 12

373	FS78.063	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Revisit Plan Change 29 for a more palatable, re-written version that gives better protection to neighbours sunlight, heritage and areas of character in Our City. 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 in part	Section 12
374	S104.002	Amelia Pitt	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Pick one area and build a block of higher buildings where there is no other surrounding properties affected.	I suggest for adding more available housing for people, pick ONE area and build a block of higher buildings where there is no other surrounding properties effected, such as at the maitai campground or brook campground where people are already pilling up in caravans, cars and tents which isn't safe either, these people can actually use and are in need of housing. I'm not saying to cover the entire campground in buildings because we also need our nature and campgrounds for outdoors time and for tourism in the nelson area.	Reject	Section 12
375	S104.003	Amelia Pitt	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Invest in places that need redoing or repairing to the healthy homes standard.	Investing in housing for economical growth is fair, why not invest in places that need redoing or repairing such as franklyn village or the groups of flats on nile st (before you go over the bridge towards the maitai). These places already house people who need warm homes and could hold a lot more people if repaired and held to the healthy homes standard required by ALL rentals. IF you spent money repairing places like that, people would have more options for living or better yet WANT to live in places like that because at the moment those places don't meet the basic standard of living requirement to appearance. For franklyn village for example, you could fit TWO high rise buildings in that area if turned around and parking changed in that area.	Reject	Section 10
376	S104.004	Amelia Pitt	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Revise the plan change using as much community engagement as possible, and email [all ratepayers] when the revised version of the plan is open for consultation.	This is in no way a rejection of proposed housing intensity and growth, but just a way of ensuring a more thoughtful 'better fit' for the uniqueness of our City, District and its Residents. I would also strongly recommend that in line with your offer of 'as much community engagement as possible', and... I'm highly disgusted we weren't emailed this and request that we are emailed when the revised version of the plan is open for consultation... Nothing should be done without FULL PUBLIC DISCLOSURE, we are the people of here & today, respect us and don't try to pull the wool over our eyes.	Reject	Section 10
377	S109.001	Joyanne Stevens	Mapping	Oppose	Delete the proposed High Density Residential Zone in its current form as outlined in chapter RE1.8.and make consequential amendments to the planning maps to remove the large areas proposed to be zoned high density residential.	The Council has taken a very cavalier attitude to the introduction of this proposed plan change. At the very least it should have prepared draft documents for informal pre-consultation instead of rushing directly to the formal RMA plan change process. This would have enabled the issues to be worked through sensibly before embarking on a statutory process which is very user unfriendly and intimidating. Appalling lack of discussion before entering formal consultation phase. Given the ageing population and decreasing birth rates, the population projections used to justify this Proposed Plan Change are pie in the sky and will not be achieved for many decades, if achieved at all. The current Plan provisions for high density development remain appropriate for the foreseeable future, and the requirement for resource consents in order to address any plans for intensive or out of scale developments are also considered appropriate. Residential buildings up to six storeys in height are not appropriate in the zone that has been included in the planning maps as high density residential.	Accept in part	Section 12

378	S109.005	Joyanne Stevens	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Retain the existing high density provisions	Large areas are proposed to be rezoned for high density residential development which fails to meet the aspirations and expectations of existing residents of those areas. Residents should be protected from unreasonable development of existing neighbourhoods, and the best way to do this is to retain the current provisions whereby developers are required to be sensitive to the effects of their proposals on adjacent areas.	Accept in part	Section 12
379	S109.007	Joyanne Stevens	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S109.001, S109.003 and S109.013].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
380	S109.010	Joyanne Stevens	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 the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
381	S109.012	Joyanne Stevens	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S109.001 and S109.005 and the original submission.	Accept in part	Section 12
382	S109.015	Joyanne Stevens	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Request] robust analysis to determine whether there is in fact a housing crisis, and assessment of the effects of an aging population and declining birth rates on housing demand.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 10
383	S111.001	Peter Lole	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reconsider all aspects of Plan Change 29 and present a revised Plan for public submission.	At a meeting on September 7 presented by the Mayor, councillors and council staff and attended by 3-400 Nelson residents, the many deficiencies of the Plan were commented on and criticised. These included demographic predictions on which the Plan is based; intensification in potential slip zones; allowing high intensification multi-storey development in settled neighbourhoods; intensification straining inadequate infrastructure; a lack of community input to the Plan; a perceived lack of control of that which is built; the short time frame to allow for public submissions.	Reject	Section 9
384	S112.002	Andy Clover	Inner City and City Fringe Zones	Oppose in part	Support strategic intensification.	Encourage strategic intensification where it does not directly and negatively impact on existing residents, such as inner city developments, allowing retail and commercial buildings to contain dwellings above street level, mixed residential/commercial buildings, and facilitating tiny house dwellings on residential properties.	Reject	Section 10
385	S113.001	Barbara Greene	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent panel to hear the submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
386	S113.002	Barbara Greene	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Give a further notice extending the closing date for submissions.	I acknowledge that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
387	S113.003	Barbara Greene	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Allow a couple / few more subdivisions that are purpose designed (including amenities) for beautiful, functional, healthy, affordable, dense housing in a desirable village format.	New Zealand has a history of very poor town planning, e.g. not making precincts for people's enjoyment and well-being alongside and amongst our beautiful natural landscape. In fact, not the best consideration of peoples' and natures' well-being at all. Plan change 29 is largely making the same mistakes.	Reject	Section 13
388	S113.004	Barbara Greene	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Requests] the Council take a Governance led model for intensification which ensures a principled approach to the task, including well researched and imaginative city design.	I reject plan change 29 in its entirety because rezoning and rule changing is an overly simplistic broad-brush approach to urban intensification. The latter is a task that requires principled area-by-area design and case-by-case fine tuning. The PC29 proposal lays the city open to developer led expediency that lacks the coherence and elegance of a well-planned city.	Accept in part	Section 12

389	S113.005	Barbara Greene	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Establish a Statement of Principles that must be adhered to for all intensification activity.	Refer to reasons in submission point S113.004.	Reject	Section 13
390	S113.006	Barbara Greene	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Commit to the principle of] localization, which recognises that: Intensification must not degrade the surrounding and living conditions of exisitng residents. Plans for any neighbourhood must be agreed to by that neighbourhood. Short distances from amenities is desirable.	Refer to reasons in submission points S113.004 and S113.005.	Reject	Section 13
391	S113.007	Barbara Greene	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Undertake an] assessment of the capacity of essential amenities [and infrastructure].	Many are already stretched to meet demand or closed to new clients (for example Stoke Medical Centre).	Reject	Section 11
392	S113.008	Barbara Greene	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Commit to the principle of] liveability, which recognises that: Community wellbeing is enhanced by a [diverse] community. Concentration of a single demographic brings social problems. Green space and local gathering places are important to human health. Permeability for people, rainfall, and sunlight, is essential.	Refer to reasons submission points S113.004 and S113.005.	Reject	Section 13
393	S113.012	Barbara Greene	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Commit to the principle of] environmental integrity, which recognises that: Minimal use of concrete construction will lower building carbon emissions profiles [and] maximal use of wood construction will provide a little carbon sequestration for the city.	Refer to reasons in submission points S113.004 and S113.005.	Reject	Section 13
394	S113.014	Barbara Greene	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Research attractive city intensification design elsewhere in the world.	Find examples that are responsive to the relationship between human well-being, the built environment and nature.	Accept in part	Section 13
395	S113.015	Barbara Greene	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Workshop the Statement of Principles with property developers and other stakeholders.	Be clear with what is expected of them. Refer to reasons in submission points S113.004 and S113.005.	Reject	Section 13
396	S113.016	Barbara Greene	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Allocate ratepayer funding to the acquisition or rental of land for the building of a small number of model intensification areas with well-planned green space, ground floor malls and amenities, children's spaces, and so on. Do this in partnership with [local business and industry] to achieve broader community benefits. Engage with property owners to build model developments that may span several properties.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
397	S113.018	Barbara Greene	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Do no] allow unprincipled developer led intensification.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
398	S113.019	Barbara Greene	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Do not] allow low-vision expedient intensification.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

399	S114.003	Matt Ellery	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the intensification of residential housing on Tahunanui Hills.	Intensification of our neighbourhood is only going to add additional volume to our streets. Why install traffic calming / traffic reducing measures and then add more dwellings (and more people) to our neighbourhood which will increase the volume on these same streets? Tahuna Hills is definitely not [accessible]: - We don't have a bus service that runs on Tosswill Rd and Stansell Ave. - There is only one pedestrian crossing along the entire length of road between Bisley Ave and the roundabout at the end of Tahunanui Drive. This crossing is at times unsafe as it's the one and only route for all heavy vehicles heading to Port Nelson. - There is a State Highway separating the proposed intensified areas and the few amenities that are available (school, petrol station, bakery etc).	Accept in part	Section 12
400	FS61.070	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Intensification of our neighbourhood is only going to add additional volume to our streets. Why install traffic calming / traffic reducing measures and then add more dwellings (and more people) to our neighbourhood which will increase the volume on these same streets? Tahuna Hills is definitely not [accessible]: - We don't have a bus service that runs on Tosswill Rd and Stansell Ave. - There is only one pedestrian crossing along the entire length of road between Bisley Ave and the roundabout at the end of Tahunanui Drive. This crossing is at times unsafe as it's the one and only route for all heavy vehicles heading to Port Nelson. - There is a State Highway separating the proposed intensified areas and the few amenities that are available (school, petrol station, bakery etc). Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Spot on analysis of Tahunanui community regarding amenities and accessibility, need a Tahunanui community led engagement, not this broad brush approach.	Accept in part	Section 12
401	FS72.074	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Intensification of our neighbourhood is only going to add additional volume to our streets. Why install traffic calming / traffic reducing measures and then add more dwellings (and more people) to our neighbourhood which will increase the volume on these same streets? Tahuna Hills is definitely not [accessible]: - We don't have a bus service that runs on Tosswill Rd and Stansell Ave. - There is only one pedestrian crossing along the entire length of road between Bisley Ave and the roundabout at the end of Tahunanui Drive. This crossing is at times unsafe as it's the one and only route for all heavy vehicles heading to Port Nelson. - There is a State Highway separating the proposed intensified areas and the few amenities that are available (school, petrol station, bakery etc). Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Spot on analysis of Tahunanui community regarding amenities and accessibility, need a Tahunanui community led engagement, not this broad brush approach.	Accept in part	Section 12

402	FS60.066	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Intensification of our neighbourhood is only going to add additional volume to our streets. Why install traffic calming / traffic reducing measures and then add more dwellings (and more people) to our neighbourhood which will increase the volume on these same streets? Tahuna Hills is definitely not [accessible]: - We don't have a bus service that runs on Tosswill Rd and Stansell Ave. - There is only one pedestrian crossing along the entire length of road between Bisley Ave and the roundabout at the end of Tahunanui Drive. This crossing is at times unsafe as it's the one and only route for all heavy vehicles heading to Port Nelson. - There is a State Highway separating the proposed intensified areas and the few amenities that are available (school, petrol station, bakery etc). Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Spot on analysis of Tahunanui community regarding amenities and accessibility, need a Tahunanui community led engagement, not this broad brush approach.	Accept in part	Section 12
403	S114.006	Matt Ellery	Entire Plan Change	Support	[Prioritise] housing growth and intensification [and population growth] with the inner city before expanding this to other areas.	Nelson City needs life introduced to it so as to add some vibrancy to the inner city which it is current lacking.	Accept	Section 9
404	S114.007	Matt Ellery	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Gradually allow change in intensification I.e allow building heights to increase gradually overtime, allow decrease in yard setbacks gradually overtime. Residential change can then occur more naturally.	Residential change can then occur more naturally.	Reject	Section 10
405	S114.008	Matt Ellery	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	{Apply] the proposes changes to rules and regulations to new subdivision developments instead of changing them in existing residential areas.	If rules are changed in new residential developments (where no one already lives) to allow intensification then those who buy in these areas will know what the rules are before purchasing. A bit like the covenants which some developments have. These are known to potential buyers before they purchase. It is unfair to change the rules on existing property owners who have purchased their properties in good faith knowing what rules (and covenants) apply.	Reject	Section 12
406	S116.001	Jill Ford	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Support more intensive homes in Nelson, [subject to the changes set out in the submission].	I totally support more intensive homes in nelson but feel strongly that a few changes need to be made. I am very concerned about the urban sprawl in the region, and valuable horticultural land being converted to housing. Also lack of low income housing.	Reject	Section 12
407	S118.001	Maurice Ormsby	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Delete the] High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 12 m.	I oppose the creation of a High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 12m, as it is not mandated under NPS-UD 2020. Refer to reasons in submission point S118.002.	Accept in part	Section 12
408	S118.004	Maurice Ormsby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S118.001 and S118.002 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
409	S118.005	Maurice Ormsby	Residential Zones	Oppose	High rise buildings could go up at the base of the hills along Milton Street which would cast shadow only along the hillside, behind which native bush would flourish. The 4 or 6 storey buildings would face north for full sun.	There is no evidence that there is a housing crisis in Nelson that requires chaotic plan changes.	Reject	Section 9
410	S118.008	Maurice Ormsby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
411	S118.009	Maurice Ormsby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the Closing Date for Submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13

412	S119.001	Mary Ormsby	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Delete the] High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 12 m.	I oppose the creation of a High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 12m, as it is not mandated under NPS-UD 2020. Such buildings (i.e. 6 levels) are not suitable for families with children or older people who become dependent on function elevators.	Accept in part	Section 12
413	S119.005	Mary Ormsby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S119.001 and S119.002 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
414	S119.006	Mary Ormsby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
415	S119.007	Mary Ormsby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the Closing Date for Submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
416	S120.004	Marion Van Dijk	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 S120.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
417	S120.006	Marion Van Dijk	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S120.001 and S120.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
418	S120.007	Marion Van Dijk	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
419	S120.008	Marion Van Dijk	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
420	S121.004	Catherine Beattie	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 S121.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
421	S121.006	Catherine Beattie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S121.001 and S121.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
422	S121.007	Catherine Beattie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
423	S121.008	Catherine Beattie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
424	S122.004	Linda Holloway	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.	Accept in part	Section 12
425	S122.006	Linda Holloway	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S122.001 and S122.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
426	S122.007	Linda Holloway	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
427	S122.008	Linda Holloway	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
428	S123.004	Anne Kolless	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	Accept in part	Section 12
429	S123.006	Anne Kolless	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S123.001 and S123.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
430	S123.007	Anne Kolless	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
431	S123.008	Anne Kolless	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13

432	S123.009	Anne Kolless	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Buy some used car yards and build appropriate size residential flats of no more than 3 storeys high, facing sunny aspect, and walkable / bicycle distance to inner city facilities and Maitai Valley picnic spots.	The imposition that could be created by developers who want to make money and don't care about well-established Nelson citizens.	Reject	Section 13
433	S124.004	Brian Strong	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 S124.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
434	S124.006	Brian Strong	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones. Restrict Housing Growth Plan (PC29) to the CBD area, not residential areas of our city.	Refer to reasons in submission points S124.001 and S124.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
435	FS5.012	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 9
436	S124.007	Brian Strong	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	The hearing board should be independent of Councillors and Council staff who have already indicated a desire for the plan to be approved in its current form.	Reject	Section 13
437	S124.008	Brian Strong	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions. I request a submission timeframe suitable for the scale of change that is proposed and that 100 days would be more in line with expectations.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
438	S124.009	Brian Strong	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	I am a Nelson home owner/residence who would be adversely affected by these changes. I reject 100% Plan Change 29.	Reject	Section 9
439	S124.010	Brian Strong	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S124.011.	Reject	Section 13
440	S124.011	Brian Strong	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
441	S124.012	Brian Strong	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
442	S124.013	Brian Strong	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
443	S124.015	Brian Strong	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S124.014.	Reject	Section 13

444	S124.019	Brian Strong	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
445	S124.020	Brian Strong	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 12
446	FS28.008	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 in part	Section 12
447	S124.022	Brian Strong	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
448	S124.027	Brian Strong	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S124.014 and S124.020.	Reject	Section 13
449	S124.028	Brian Strong	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
450	FS5.013	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 9
451	S124.036	Brian Strong	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
452	S124.038	Brian Strong	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
453	S124.039	Brian Strong	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

454	S128.004	Avril Peterson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Delete the] High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 12 m.	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. See reasons in submission point S128.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
455	S128.006	Avril Peterson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones. If there is to be intensification, it should be near the city centre.	See reasons in submission points S128.001 and S128.004 above. I am against high density high buildings in my area. This is why I came to Nelson.	Accept in part	Section 12
456	S128.007	Avril Peterson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
457	S128.008	Avril Peterson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the Closing Date for Submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
458	S128.009	Avril Peterson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Stop the additional rate addition so under utilised houses can be used to increase rental numbers.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
459	S128.010	Avril Peterson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Stop land banking so investors are rated out of the area. If the land stays without a residential unit for over 5 years, calculate the capital gain made and rate that gain at 40% of it. It would discourage this type of land banking.	Not stated..	Reject	Section 9
460	S129.001	Jude Tarr	Mapping	Oppose	Remove high density residential zone from Nelson South.	Most of the residential areas where the high density is proposed currently is existing single storey residential homes. I think under Plan Change 29, Nelson South should remain in the General Residential Zone, this will allow up to two storeys and still retain the heritage character that we all love.	Reject	Section 12
461	FS65.043	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Remove high density residential zone from Nelson South. Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): We support new precinct and extension to surrounding area (Fairfield South, Nelson Plan).	Accept in Part	Section 12
462	FS78.066	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Remove high density residential zone from Nelson South. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
463	S131.006	Diane Chandler	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose the plan change in its entirety.	Increased intensification will result in more on-street car parking and the narrow streets of Nelson will become a hazard to pedestrians, mobility scooters, cyclists, refuse collection and Emergency Service vehicles. This will cause fracturing of neighbourly relations and communities. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
464	S131.007	Diane Chandler	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Support multi storey buildings in the Nelson CBD, but not in residential areas, or areas which affect residential areas.	The loss of privacy, loss of sunlight, increased noise, mental health issues are a major concern for existing residents who potentially have six storey buildings looking into their homes and backyards. High rise buildings will detrimentally affect the character and soul of Nelson. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
465	S131.008	Diane Chandler	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Ensure we have infrastructure and services to meet the increased population.	I am concerned that the existing infrastructure in Nelson need to being increased to cope with the proposed increase in our population. Infrastructure listed in the submission includes schools, preschools, daycare ... dementia units... wastewater, sewer, parking, rubbish collection, drinking water... Parking, roads... hospital ... Health services. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 11

466	FS81.002	Patricia Ann Morris		Support	Accept	As per my original submission S202 which states that the current infrastructure cannot cope with the existing population because of this I am against 6 storeys high developments. The current infrastructure cannot cope with the existing population, so to increase housing density will cause more problems. Money should be spent on maintaining what we have got, before new builds, especially 6 floors high.	Reject	Section 11
467	FS82.002	Richard Terry Morris		Support	Accept	I disagree with the intensification of Nelson. There is not the infrastructure to properly support the existing population. The more intense a population is, the greater demand there is on infrastructure. Both National and International figures bear this out. Population Density was studied by Dr Calhoun, and others, may years ago and their unpleasant findings have been born out - again National and International figures will confirm this.	Reject	Section 11
468	S131.010	Diane Chandler	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Any policy direction should not have adverse effects that diminish the amenity of neighbouring areas, it should ensure activities do not adversely affect the environment and amenity values of an area and do not adversely affect existing activities and enjoyment of existing neighbours homes.	Not stated.	Accept in part	Section 12
469	S131.011	Diane Chandler	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Take the Stoke Valleys [Ngawhatu and Marsden Valleys] into account when considering the amount of land available for housing [inferred].	Recently I walked up Ngawhatu Valley in stoke - there is so much land and then i walked over to Marsden Valley where there is much housing being build (two storey units under construction). There has been so much housing development in stoke that has this been taken into account as it seems they say no land - but houses are sprouting like mushrooms in Ngawhatu and Marsden valleys and Ngawhatu has land for miles still to develop.	Accept	Section 12
470	S133.001	Michael Johnston	Mapping	Oppose	[Oppose Plan Change 29 and the changes proposed to Nelson South in particular].	The Nelson South area has historical, cultural and landscape values that are recognised in the current plan. The proposed change fails to acknowledge this. All Nelson South residents know that it is the backdrop comprising the area between the CBD and the Grampians that gives our city much of its character and uniqueness - it is something that visitors to Nelson frequently comment on. If you happen to have a property that is on the south side of such a development (it may be the only one in your block for a decade or more) then this is literally cold comfort.	Reject	Section 12
471	FS65.044	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: The Nelson South area has historical, cultural and landscape values that are recognised in the current plan. The proposed change fails to acknowledge this. [Oppose Plan Change 29 and the changes proposed to Nelson South in particular]. Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): We support new precinct and extension to surrounding area (Fairfield South, Nelson Plan).	Reject	Section 12
472	FS78.067	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: The Nelson South area has historical, cultural and landscape values that are recognised in the current plan. The proposed change fails to acknowledge this. [Oppose Plan Change 29 and the changes proposed to Nelson South in particular]. Reassess the Fairfield/Nelson South area as a character precinct with additional protections.	Reject	Section 12

473	S133.002	Michael Johnston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Review the process to make it more specific with less uncertainty for property owners.	In proposing to rezone huge areas would mean that everyone in those areas now have little certainty in life as at any time (be it tomorrow or in thirty years hence) things for them could dramatically change for the worse. Council needs to remove this uncertainty by more thoroughly investigating where development can and should occur rather that adopting such a heavy handed and (to both residents and to the character of Nelson) insensitive approach.	Reject	Section 12
474	S135.001	Matthew Schep	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the adoption of Plan 29, subject to the additional requests set out in the submission.	Nelson, like every region in Aotearoa, is growing in population, and every person deserves decent housing. As a geographically limited region, we do not have the capacity to engage in mass urban sprawl, and urban sprawl is also an inefficient, ugly, rurally invasive, polluting practice that should be limited where practicably possible. I encourage the Council to go ahead with Plan 29, with appropriate changes as needed to minimise impact on existing residents. I do not support opposition to this plan that is rooted in xenophobia, racism, misinformation, and fearmongering.	Accept	Section 9
475	S135.002	Matthew Schep	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the changes to allow buildings of greater height in Nelson where the area is suitable - in particular, where it is accessible to bus routes and where is it most resilient to natural hazards and climate change.	I encourage the Council to consult very carefully and very meticulously on this resilience as a small mistake could be very costly and dangerous for future residents. Refer also to the reasons in submission point S135.001.	Accept in part	Section 13
476	S135.008	Matthew Schep	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the submission window until at least the end of October.	Plan 29 is a large transformational change, and people need time to digest it and think through their views.	Reject	Section 13
477	S136.001	Beverley Trengrove	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject [Plan] Change 29.	The impact on the heritage of this city. The lack of social planning and long term effects. Lack of long term vision. Impact on why it is that people come to this city. The far reaching effects beyond what is immediate.	Accept in part	Section 12
478	FS65.046	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Reject [Plan] Change 29 due to impact of heritage on this city. 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 in part	Section 12
479	FS78.068	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Reject [Plan] Change 29 due to impact of heritage on this city. 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 in part	Section 12
480	S137.003	Sherrilyn Spilman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Restrict intensification to the Inner City Centre and Inner City Fringe zones.	I accept that intensification of housing is necessary to avoid urban sprawl into productive farmland. However, that intensification should be restricted to the city centre and city fringe.	Reject	Section 13

481	S139.002	Ben Gardner-Thorne	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Change the plan.	We are located at the back of Whareama Care Centre and we understand that this to be knocked down and turned into [Kāinga Ora] housing. Not only does [Kāinga Ora] support many people who don't work and are on benefits we would be concerned with what kind of people are being brought in this close to our house and children. We also don't want to see 6 story buildings which could result in more than 100 people being brought into this area. Losing all our sunlight in the hours we are home would result in us moving house and most likely being forced to move out of Nelson because the house prices are beyond crazy as it so we would be out of lucky even having a chance to try buy again in this region right now. The noise levels this could increase coming down onto our one-story house could result in our future children getting less sleep, us getting less sleep and us all feeling miserable in our home that we worked so hard for. Let along the risk this would put us in within our jobs. Change the plan 100% its not for our community.	Reject	Section 9
482	S140.001	Jon Wahlberg	Mapping	Oppose	Retain existing Residential Zone adjacent to the Rural Zone, including Rural - Lower Density Small Holdings Area, unless otherwise supported by landowner.	There is great potential to create reverse sensitive issues with increased housing density; reduced sections sizes and reduced section shapes next to rural property which seeks to undertake rural activities. Council needs to be zoning a gradient of activities adjacent to the rural zone to avoid matters arising which restricts rural activities.	Reject	Section 10
483	S143.001	Marie Calderbank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject [Plan Change] 29.	Strongly suggest, in the greater interests of the wider community, that Plan Change 29 be pushed back to the planners, for a more palatable, re-written version that gives better protection to neighbours sunlight, heritage, social cohesiveness and areas of character in our City. This is in no way a rejection of proposed housing intensity and growth, but just a way of ensuring a more thoughtful 'better fit' for the uniqueness of our City, District and its Residents. I would also strongly recommend that in line with your offer of 'as much community engagement as possible', that every rate payer on your data base is emailed when the revised version of the plan is open for consultation and I personally give to you my consent for NCC to email to me that notification.	Reject	Section 13
484	S145.001	Genevieve Gilchrist	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone and Medium Density from existing low density residential suburbs.	Our home is in the high density zone and I'm very stressed that we could have a six storey building built a metre away from our fence. The main reasons for buying our house is that it gets all day sun, is in a quiet and friendly neighbourhood, close to town and is completely private. The possibility that a six storey building can be built on our northern boundary at any time in the future is very stressful to live with and I have actually had to go to the doctor to get help with my anxiety (first time I have had stress). Also stressful is that our house valuation would drop and may be difficult to sell if a building can be built so close next door. I am not against intensification but PLEASE can this be done in the city itself or areas where it won't impact on neighbours' sunshine, health and pleasure of living in an established home. I was born in Nelson and now retired and I find the stress very hard to cope with.	Accept in part	Section 12
485	S146.004	Murray Dench	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 S146.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
486	S146.006	Murray Dench	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	See reasons in submission points S146.001 and S146.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
487	FS5.011	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 9

488	S146.007	Murray Dench	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
489	S146.008	Murray Dench	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
490	S147.004	Rosemary Weir	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 S147.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
491	S147.006	Rosemary Weir	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S147.001 and S147.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
492	S147.007	Rosemary Weir	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
493	S147.008	Rosemary Weir	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
494	S148.004	Natalya Dempsey	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 S148.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
495	S148.006	Natalya Dempsey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S148.001 and S148.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
496	S148.007	Natalya Dempsey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
497	S148.008	Natalya Dempsey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
498	S149.004	Cheryl Walls	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 S149.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
499	S149.006	Cheryl Walls	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S149.001 and S149.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
500	S149.007	Cheryl Walls	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
501	S149.008	Cheryl Walls	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
502	S150.004	Keryn McKay	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 S150.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
503	S150.006	Keryn McKay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S150.001 and S150.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
504	S150.007	Keryn McKay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
505	S150.008	Keryn McKay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
506	S151.004	Janice Michel	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 S151.001.	Accept in part	Section 12

507	S151.006	Janice Michel	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S151.001 and S151.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
508	S151.007	Janice Michel	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
509	S151.008	Janice Michel	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
510	S152.004	Christine Parai	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 S152.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
511	S152.006	Christine Parai	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S152.001 and S152.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
512	S152.007	Christine Parai	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
513	S152.008	Christine Parai	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
514	S153.004	John Cunningham	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 S153.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
515	S153.006	John Cunningham	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S153.001 and S153.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
516	S153.007	John Cunningham	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
517	S153.008	John Cunningham	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
518	S154.004	Sharon Thomas	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 S154.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
519	S154.006	Sharon Thomas	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S154.001 and S154.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
520	S154.007	Sharon Thomas	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
521	S154.008	Sharon Thomas	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
522	S155.004	Giulia Rogers	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 S155.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
523	S155.006	Giulia Rogers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S155.001 and S155.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
524	S155.007	Giulia Rogers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
525	S155.008	Giulia Rogers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13

526	S156.004	Sylvia Meredyth	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 S156.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
527	S156.006	Sylvia Meredyth	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S156.001 and S156.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
528	S156.007	Sylvia Meredyth	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
529	S156.008	Sylvia Meredyth	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
530	S157.004	Belinda-Jane Hart	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 S157.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
531	S157.006	Belinda-Jane Hart	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S157.001 and S157.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
532	S157.007	Belinda-Jane Hart	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
533	S157.008	Belinda-Jane Hart	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
534	S158.001	Peter Rickards	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose [Plan Change 29].	We as home owners have purchased Our home in good faith relying on the council regulations for density and height. We have a right to our sunlight and to our view not to be shadowed by high buildings 1 1/2 m from the boundary. This will not only affect the way we live but valuation of our home which for many of us is our largest asset. Higher density with large buildings will only create poor living conditions for many and reduce demographics creating possibly an inner-city slum area.	Reject	Section 11
535	S161.004	Chris and Sandra Sutcliffe	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 S161.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
536	S161.006	Chris and Sandra Sutcliffe	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S161.001 and S161.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
537	S161.007	Chris and Sandra Sutcliffe	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
538	S161.008	Chris and Sandra Sutcliffe	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13

539	S161.011	Chris and Sandra Sutcliffe	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Amalgamate Nelson Girls and Boys college into one campus utilising all boarding buildings. Eliminate Nelson Intermediate (form 1 and 2 stay in local primary schools or form 2 goes to a Junior High School like Marlborough College). Eliminate the Prep School and use the campus for housing (this school should not be in existence because it is a fee paying school leading to a state funded high school). Following on the above, all extra land to be used for medium density housing (e.g. campuses in Auckland are greater than 1500-2000 per school). Make this area 3-4 storey housing.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
540	S161.013	Chris and Sandra Sutcliffe	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Now that we have a reliable public transport system in Nelson, the Council [should] find suitable sites along these routes especially in existing light industrial areas where bus routes are located.	In other countries, e.g. Australia, new housing developments must have 20% of housing allocated to state housing, pepper potted around the buildings and also located around major public transport routes.	Reject	Section 12
541	S161.014	Chris and Sandra Sutcliffe	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Amalgamate Nelson and Tasman Councils [and develop] regional plan.	Simply by amalgamating Nelson and Tasman Councils, an overall regional plan could be instigated.	Reject	Section 9
542	S162.004	Mark Gabites	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 S162.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
543	S162.006	Mark Gabites	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S162.001 and S162.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
544	S162.007	Mark Gabites	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
545	S162.008	Mark Gabites	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
546	S162.010	Mark Gabites	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seeks to expand outside the CBD with access to the bus service].	Spend[ing] time and money on the bus service as you are currently doing to allow the expansion outside of the CBD is just the sensible thing to do. Please maintain the "sunshine" capitol.	Reject	Section 13
547	S163.004	Pauline Rodgers	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 S163.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
548	S163.006	Pauline Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S163.001 and S163.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
549	S163.007	Pauline Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
550	S163.008	Pauline Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
551	S163.009	Pauline Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the planning phase to fully assess the implications, thereby fostering a strong and content community for both current and future residents.	PC 29 has the potential to bring about profound and lasting changes to the face of Nelson city. Unfortunately, it appears that this plan is being rushed through without the necessary in-depth analysis, robust community engagement, or consideration of potential unintended consequences.	Reject	Section 13

552	S163.010	Pauline Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seeks] requirements for essential aspects such as parking provision, preservation of sunlight, green spaces, trees, noise reduction, traffic management, privacy considerations.	Under the provisions of [PC29] there seems to be a glaring absence of requirements for essential aspects such as parking provision, preservation of sunlight, green spaces, trees, noise reduction, traffic management, privacy considerations and the overall enhancement of the quality of life for residents.	Reject	Section 11
553	S163.011	Pauline Rodgers	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Restrict] higher density in residential areas to acknowledge unique character and amenity of residential areas.	The alterations to zoning in residential areas, resulting in higher density, appear excessive and unsuitable, potentially leading to an inequitable outcome for those residing in these neighbourhoods. The plan seems to lack a proper acknowledgement of the unique character and existing amenities of these residential areas.	Accept in Part	Section 12
554	S164.004	Leigh Thompson	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 S164.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
555	S164.006	Leigh Thompson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, NOT the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S164.001 and S164.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
556	S164.007	Leigh Thompson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
557	S164.008	Leigh Thompson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
558	S165.004	Adele Yank	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 S165.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
559	S165.006	Adele Yank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S165.001 and S165.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
560	S165.007	Adele Yank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
561	S165.008	Adele Yank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
562	S165.009	Adele Yank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Address the priorities - hospital, schools, GP practices, better roads THEN try and sort out the housing crisis.	Plan Change 29 is, in my opinion pointless without addressing basic issues first. By this I mean our infrastructure - we have a shortage of hospital beds now, a shortage of school places now, a shortage of doctors and GP practices accepting new patients currently - putting in more homes will and can only add to the chaos, not only in the things I have mentioned but also on our roads. Take Dodson Valley Road, at present the only route up to Springlea Heights, already congested and to consider a 6 storey building with no dedicated parking spaces is madness in my opinion. Get the basics in place THEN build. Nelson is not ready for plan change 29.	Reject	Section 11
563	S166.004	Garth Crosbie	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 S166.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
564	S166.006	Garth Crosbie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S166.001 and S166.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
565	S166.007	Garth Crosbie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
566	S166.008	Garth Crosbie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13

567	S166.009	Garth Crosbie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Plan [medium and high density] into all the new subdivisions going in, not into our local community that has already been developed, upper Toi Toi, Bayview, Princes Dr, Wakapuaka.	Our streets and infrastructure are already at capacity putting more people into one section will create more pressure, there won't be enough car parking. NCC are looking after the developer not the local resident.	Accept in part	Section 12
568	S167.004	Petra Dunlop	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 s167.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
569	S167.006	Petra Dunlop	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S167.001 and S167.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
570	S167.007	Petra Dunlop	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
571	S167.008	Petra Dunlop	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
572	S167.013	Petra Dunlop	Residential Zones	Oppose	Increase to affordable homes / first time buyers.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
573	S167.014	Petra Dunlop	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Less public housing.	Public housing drives prices down to surrounding area.	Reject	Section 13
574	S167.015	Petra Dunlop	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Provide] Council housing for pensioners.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
575	S167.016	Petra Dunlop	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Develop] schemes that support moving people from underutilised homes, e.g. elderly.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
576	S167.017	Petra Dunlop	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Stop increasing rates.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
577	S168.001	Anthony Goldsworthy	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the plan and register my opposition to the campaign being run to oppose Plan Change 29 by unidentified persons through mail drop and other methods.	No NIMBY's.	Accept in part	Section 12
578	S169.004	Andrew Dunlop	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Delete the] High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 8m.	I oppose the creation of a High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 8 m as it is not mandated under NPS-UD 2020. Refer to reasons in submission point S169.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
579	S169.006	Andrew Dunlop	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S169.001 and S169.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
580	S169.007	Andrew Dunlop	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
581	S169.008	Andrew Dunlop	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
582	S169.011	Andrew Dunlop	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the MDZ under PC29.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 12
583	S170.004	Owen Dunlop	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Delete the] High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 8m.	I oppose the creation of a High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 8 m as it is not mandated under NPS-UD 2020. Refer to reasons in submission point S170.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
584	S170.006	Owen Dunlop	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S170.001 and S170.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
585	S170.007	Owen Dunlop	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
586	S170.008	Owen Dunlop	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
587	S171.004	Graham Pomeroy	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 S171.001.	Accept in part	Section 12

588	S171.006	Graham Pomeroy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S171.001 and S171.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
589	S171.007	Graham Pomeroy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
590	S171.008	Graham Pomeroy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
591	S171.009	Graham Pomeroy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Put [medium and high density] development into the Maitai subdivision.	I love living in Nelson the way it is.	Reject	Section 12
592	S172.004	John Sandston	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 S172.001. I am concerned about having very high buildings near Nelson College for Girls. It will give the school a ghetto feel which will be bad for the kids.	Accept in part	Section 12
593	S172.006	John Sandston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S172.001 and S172.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
594	S172.007	John Sandston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
595	S172.008	John Sandston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
596	S172.010	John Sandston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Allow more greenfield development in the north of Nelson.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
597	S173.004	Leigh Davies	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 S173.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
598	S173.006	Leigh Davies	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S173.001 and S173.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
599	S173.007	Leigh Davies	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
600	S173.008	Leigh Davies	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
601	S173.009	Leigh Davies	Residential Zones	Oppose	Keep the high and medium intensification within the city centre and out to the industrial area rather than further intensifying the southern suburbs. Build only two units per section rather than the proposed three.	Nelson South already provides affordable housing for low income families. Further intensification will devalue the area both in neighbourhood interaction and increased traffic. All increased building will take away the "uniqueness" that is Nelson.	Accept in part	Section 12
602	S174.004	David Jack	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 S174.001. Three storeys should be a maximum for this 'hilly' city full of beautiful older homes. Let's keep it the way it was built.	Accept in part	Section 12
603	S174.006	David Jack	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S174.001 and S174.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
604	S174.007	David Jack	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13

605	S174.008	David Jack	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
606	S175.004	Alton Street Heritage Precinct	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 S175.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
607	S175.006	Alton Street Heritage Precinct	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S175.001 and S175.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
608	S175.007	Alton Street Heritage Precinct	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
609	S175.008	Alton Street Heritage Precinct	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
610	S175.012	Alton Street Heritage Precinct	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Undertake] consultation with public starting with heritage and earthquake inventory, followed by town planning.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
611	FS65.047	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: [Undertake] consultation with public starting with heritage and earthquake inventory, followed by town planning. 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 in part	Section 12
612	FS78.069	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: [Undertake] consultation with public starting with heritage and earthquake inventory, followed by town planning. 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 12
613	S176.004	Roger Weeks	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 S176.001. [There is a] possibility of a drop in property values close to high density housing. I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency.	Accept in part	Section 12
614	S176.006	Roger Weeks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission point S176.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
615	S176.007	Roger Weeks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
616	S176.008	Roger Weeks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
617	S177.004	Peter McNae	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 S177.001.	Accept in part	Section 12

618	S177.006	Peter McNae	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S177.001 and S177.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
619	S177.007	Peter McNae	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
620	S177.008	Peter McNae	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
621	S177.009	Peter McNae	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	I urge council to reconsider [PC29].	This is a poorly conceived and consulted change that impacts the lifestyle and personal amenity of thousands of Nelsonians. There is no verified evidence of a housing emergency.	Reject	Section 9
622	S178.006	Tony No surname supplied	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	See reasons in submission points (1) and (4) above.	Accept in part	Section 12
623	S178.007	Tony No surname supplied	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	No reason given.	Reject	Section 13
624	S178.008	Tony No surname supplied	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages,	Reject	Section 13
625	S179.004	Raymond Ikink	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 S179.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
626	S179.006	Raymond Ikink	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S179.001 and S179.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
627	S179.007	Raymond Ikink	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
628	S179.008	Raymond Ikink	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
629	S179.009	Raymond Ikink	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Plan Change 29 should only happen in new subdivisions and not in established single storey residential areas.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 12
630	S180.004	Geoff Cooper	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 S180.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
631	S180.006	Geoff Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S180.001 and S180.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
632	S180.007	Geoff Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
633	S180.008	Geoff Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
634	S180.009	Geoff Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Plan and develop with Richmond.	Nelson appears to be short of suitable land for housing. Richmond is not. In 100 years they will be one entity anyway, plan now.	Reject	Section 12
635	S181.004	John Towns	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 S181.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
636	S181.006	John Towns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S181.001 and S181.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12

637	S181.007	John Towns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
638	S181.008	John Towns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
639	S181.009	John Towns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Set up a board of independent individuals who could discuss the merits of placing the blocks of apartments and put off any decision until such time that any affected parties can have their say.	It seems quite wrong that a decision to make such momentous changes can be made by three or four people with no input or discussion with the people it may affect, seems to me to be very undemocratic.	Reject	Section 13
640	S182.004	Ellen Stewart	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 S182.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
641	S182.006	Ellen Stewart	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S182.001 and S182.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
642	S182.007	Ellen Stewart	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
643	S182.008	Ellen Stewart	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
644	S182.009	Ellen Stewart	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	There are plenty of alternative options - look at what other Councils are achieving.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
645	S183.004	Sandra Hunter	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 S183.001. Housing units of 2-3 stories, interspersed with plenty of green space and connected with a good public transport system and walking/cycling tracks is important. The new e-bus system is a great step in the right direction.	Accept in part	Section 12
646	S183.006	Sandra Hunter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones. Make it easier to convert office space to residential housing.	Refer to reasons in submission points S183.001 and S183.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
647	S183.007	Sandra Hunter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
648	S183.008	Sandra Hunter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
649	S184.004	Barbara Amohanga	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 S184.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
650	S184.006	Barbara Amohanga	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S184.001 and S184.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
651	S184.007	Barbara Amohanga	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
652	S184.008	Barbara Amohanga	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
653	S184.009	Barbara Amohanga	Residential Zones	Oppose	These dwellings should be confined to the CBD and waterfront.	I do not believe building an apartment complex that could be 19.5 m tall in residential areas is sensible. These dwellings should be confined to the CBD and waterfront, where they will not affect sunlight or privacy. This will devalue my property.	Reject	Section 12

654	S185.004	Stuart Yank	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 S185.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
655	S185.006	Stuart Yank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S185.001 and S185.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
656	S185.007	Stuart Yank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
657	S185.008	Stuart Yank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
658	S185.011	Stuart Yank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Public consultation in each and every area for [the community's] particular needs.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
659	S186.004	Donna Harris	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 S186.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
660	S186.006	Donna Harris	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S186.001 and S186.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
661	S186.007	Donna Harris	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
662	S186.008	Donna Harris	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
663	S187.004	Lisa-Maria Perkins	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 S187.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
664	S187.006	Lisa-Maria Perkins	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones. Concentrate on building in the inner city. Encourage developers and/or Council to buy up vacant land in the inner city and develop housing on that. Provide incentives for current building owners in town to develop above the shops in what are currently empty unused spaces.	Refer to reasons in submission points S187.001 and S187.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
665	S187.007	Lisa-Maria Perkins	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
666	S187.008	Lisa-Maria Perkins	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
667	S188.004	Sue Cunningham	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 S188.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
668	S188.006	Sue Cunningham	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S188.001 and S188.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
669	S188.007	Sue Cunningham	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
670	S188.008	Sue Cunningham	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13

671	S188.009	Sue Cunningham	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Support existing landlords especially in the areas of collecting rent and damage to property.	Not stated.	Accept	Section 13
672	S188.010	Sue Cunningham	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Support organisations like Habitat for Humanity and Salvation Army that are already providing housing and support.	Reject	Reject	Section 13
673	S189.004	Anton Hyman	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 S189.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
674	S189.006	Anton Hyman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones. These buildings should be built in town, free from residential areas. Not by moving city boundaries into residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S189.001 and S189.004 above. I oppose this plan because the removal of sunlight causing the health of the neighbouring residents. This is caused by the height of such a building, also with such a large building the wind generated is much stronger. Such a development deprives the rate-paying residents adjacent, of their right to a liveable environment.	Accept in part	Section 12
675	S189.007	Anton Hyman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
676	S189.008	Anton Hyman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
677	S191.004	Michael Rhoades	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 S191.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
678	S191.006	Michael Rhoades	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S191.001 and S191.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
679	S191.007	Michael Rhoades	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
680	S191.008	Michael Rhoades	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
681	S191.009	Michael Rhoades	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Seek to build the proposedhigh density apartment blocks outside of current residential areas, in areasthat are currently unused farmland, such as out by Glendvan or lower Queen StRichmond.	The proposed plan 29 changes to residential housing areas is incompatible with the existing city layout and residential development.	Accept in part	Section 12
682	S192.004	Jane Jay	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 S192.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
683	S192.006	Jane Jay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S192.001 and S192.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
684	S192.007	Jane Jay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
685	S192.008	Jane Jay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
686	S193.001	Denise Hill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
687	S193.002	Denise Hill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Give further notice extending the closing date for submissions.	It is extremely difficult to digest the proposed plan 29 and the supporting documents given the short notice given to the public to read the 2000 pages of the proposal.	Reject	Section 13

688	S193.003	Denise Hill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritize housing growth and intensification within the inner city and not in existing residential areas.	Under the proposed new rules there would be three residential zones. I live in a zone where you will be permitting up to three residential units with a height of three storeys or 12m. Should this rule be agreed and my neighbours on each side of me build such units, I would be completely blocked in and have no sunlight. Additionally, without car parking spaces, there would be additional car parking in the street and this would cause traffic and pollution problems. Additionally, the infrastructure in the area is poor enough as it is, without the addition of more homes adding further pressures. The area I live in is an established residential area and I think it is heartless to allow people to overbuild in such an area. It is perhaps understandable to build several storeys high in a new build, but not in established areas. People should have the ability to put small, modular homes on their properties to create more housing, but building up is unfair on neighbours and destructive to peoples' way of life and community. I understand that the government requires the council to provide more housing for their community, however, very little of what is proposed to be built in Nelson is going to impact on affordability, unless it is public housing and this is not the case in the council's proposals.	Accept in part	Section 12
689	S193.007	Denise Hill	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Delete the] High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 12 m.	I also oppose the creation of a high density residential zone that has a maximum height greater than 12m.	Accept in part	Section 12
690	S195.002	Wendy Mansell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Right to vote on decisions affecting my community.	Every property owner should have a right to vote on council plans for their property and its future. Council's have no right to create laws which destroy peoples homes and communities.	Accept in part	Section 13
691	S195.003	Wendy Mansell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Provide] details of how council plans to deal with noise pollution and social issues created by high intensification.	Not stated.	Accept in part	Section 13
692	S195.004	Wendy Mansell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Provide] details on how council will upgrade roading, water supply, sewage, power supply to cope.	Roads are not coping now! Neither is main water valve Marsden Rd.	Accept in part	Section 9
693	S195.005	Wendy Mansell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Write] Plan Change 29 in plain English.	So that all affected property owners can understand the proposal.	Reject	Section 9
694	S197.002	Adrian Parlane	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend] the High Density Zone for Stoke to be a Medium Density Zone.	I am specifically opposed to the Medium Density Zones proposed for Stoke and I think the High Density Zone for Stoke should only be a Medium Density Zone.	Reject	Section 12
695	S197.007	Adrian Parlane	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Prioritise] inner city development before ventuiring into the suburbs.	Not stated.	Accept in part	Section 12
696	S197.013	Adrian Parlane	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Require] proposed developments [to be] exhibited with temporary pole structures similar to light scaffolding to show neighbours what can be expected.	The plan ignores daylight angles so potentially existing property owners could have, particularly, east and west aspect sun blocked, created 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.	Reject	Section 12
697	S198.053	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Entire Plan Change	Support	Retain the spatial extent of the zones proposed by PC29 as notified.	Transpower supports the spatial extent of the zones proposed by PC29 as notified. In particular, Transpower supports that rural land located around the National Grid has not been rezoned to urban land under PC29.	Reject	Section 12

698	S199.001	Steven Gray	Entire Plan Change	Support	[Approve] Plan [Change] 29 as soon as possible.	The challenge for all towns moving forward is to improve our response to the current climate and health crises. We have to confront both climate change and our increasing and costly population health crises. Plan Change 29 will address both of those issues through the intensification of the urban core and improving the active transport profile of the city. We need walkable cities and Plan Change 29 moves Nelson in that direction (away from cars and more towards active modes of transport). Additionally, Plan Change 29 is a reasonable response to the changes in zoning that have occurred at a national level. In essence, the change has already taken place and Nelson has to respond with rules that will make sense of the new ability of property owners to redevelop their properties without resource consent. Please don't be swayed by the campaign of fear and worse-case scenarios presented by opponents of this plan change. It is the right move for Nelson and intensification will occur. This plan change gives us some guidelines and rules for the coming developments.	Accept in Part	Section 9
699	S200.001	Fiona Perks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Review the whole of Plan Change 29.	The creation of a High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 12m, as it is not mandated under NPS-UD 2020. The loss of the existing protection of sunlight to all properties, because it is a critical component of residential amenity in a city as it provides warmth and energy efficiency and critical peoples well being. The [o]mission of any requirement to provide car parks in any new development. Severe lack of consultation and transparency between Council and community. Council represent the community and they have been criminal in lack of information and visual urban planning for the future of Nelson.	Accept in part	Section 12
700	S200.002	Fiona Perks	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Request] a visual plan of what Nelson will look like in the future - what type of buildings and what architecture involved.	Refer to reasons in submission point S200.001.	Reject	Section 13
701	S200.003	Fiona Perks	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Request] sustainable practices to be implemented and green spaces be provided.	Refer to reasons in submission point S200.001.	Reject	Section 11
702	S200.006	Fiona Perks	Residential Zones	Not Stated	[Request] interface between Medium and High Density zones needs to be better considered and consultation sought by immediate present houses.	Refer to reasons in submission point S200.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
703	S200.008	Fiona Perks	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Request] Council prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City - before City fringe and residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission point S200.001.	Reject	Section 10
704	S200.009	Fiona Perks	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	Request that council appoints an Independent Panel to hear the submissions.	To remove unconscious bias. Refer to reasons in submission point S200.001.	Reject	Section 13
705	S200.012	Fiona Perks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Provide] clear consultation with the community including all Nelson community apps, local media and leaflets to every household.	To provide full and transparent information. Refer to reasons in submission point S200.001.	Reject	Section 13
706	S201.001	Pierre Hammond	Entire Plan Change	Support	Proceed with the plan change.	I believe the plan change proposed is a small step towards stopping urban sprawl in the Nelson area, which will prevent extra costs for building never ending greenfield services.	Accept in part	Section 12
707	S201.004	Pierre Hammond	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Provide] a 50 year ringfence in addition to this plan change to force denser development in the area.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 9

708	S202.004	Patricia Morris	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 S202.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
709	S202.006	Patricia Morris	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S202.001 and S202.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
710	S202.007	Patricia Morris	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
711	S202.008	Patricia Morris	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the Closing Date for Submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
712	S202.009	Patricia Morris	Residential Zones	Oppose	Provide well built homes, where there is already empty property and space.	Intensification is a recipe for disaster. You only need to look at any other city in the world to see this. It will cause more problems than you can ever imagine in respect of health, violence, crime, and pollution.	Reject	Section 9
713	S202.010	Patricia Morris	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Provide an adequate number of doctors, nurses, teachers, roads, parking facilities, along with reliable sewage treatment, clean drinking water, and electricity.	The current infrastructure is insufficient to cope with the existing population. To bring more people into Nelson will add to the stress.	Reject	Section 11
714	S202.011	Patricia Morris	Entire Plan Change	Amend	[Amend] Plan change 29 so that there aren't any buildings over 2 storeys in any zone.	The idea of building 6 storeys high is appalling for the loss of natural day light that it will block out. Also people who have invested in solar panels will be affected.	Reject	Section 9
715	S202.012	Patricia Morris	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Utilise] existing empty sites and premises before new builds [and retain these] at their existing height.	There are plenty of empty sites, shops, premises, and accommodation that should be utilised before new builds. These should all stay at their existing height.	Reject	Section 13
716	S204.001	Ara Poutama Aotearoa, Department of Corrections	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the overall intent of PC29 to facilitate sufficient housing capacity to meet growth pressures, and the provision of a well-functioning urban environment to give effect to the provisions within the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD).	Ara Poutama Aotearoa, the Department of Corrections (Ara Poutama) has an interest in the implications that the Nelson Resource Management Plan (NRMP) has on the establishment and operation of residential housing in Nelson City. To achieve a well-functioning environment, it is essential that the NRMP as amended by PC29 clearly enables a diverse range of households that exist within neighbourhoods, including homes that serve particular needs in our communities. Those households may include those with specific health needs who are subject to supervision and support. To support the effective functioning of the justice system and to enable Ara Poutama to fulfil its statutory mandate, it should also include housing that it provides to those within its care.	Accept in part	Section 12
717	S206.001	Kevin Hill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29.	Herewith my submission against the proposed plans for infill/high rise housing. 5 years ago we applied for consent to subdivide our section and build a new house. Our neighbours objected to the plans because of the theoretical possibility that the new build would cast a shadow on their house - a bizarre situation given that their tress already cast far more shadow than our house ever would, yet it meant 3 lots of revised plans and thousands in extra architect fees before we got consent. Why only 5 years ago was this issue so important to council yet now many builds will undoubtedly cast huge shadows and or block views. Although the plan will not directly affect me I believe the proposed changes are grossly unfair to current homeowners and am vehemently against the plan.	Reject	Section 9

718	S207.002	Jewel Mellor	Mapping	Oppose	Amend the proposal to restrict any high density living (dwellings 3 stories or higher) to the Mixed Use and Centre City zones already set out in the draft Whakamahere Whakatu Nelson Plan.	The proposals will have a huge effect on Nelson residents and the nature and feel of the existing neighourhoods. I acknowledge that the Nelson population is growing and the need to consider how to house this growth. However, I believe that under the current plan there is space available to build high density housing. Current landowners of these areas need to held accountable and legally obliged to make the land available for this use. The High Density Residential Zone provisions are out of character with the existing Tamaki Street environment. The increased density will result in dangerous traffic conditions for children, pedestrians and drivers due to the additional traffic/ parked cars. In addition there have been a number of slips in the vicinity during the heavy rains over the last 10 years. It does not make sense to be building high rise developments on these steep hills when there is flat stable land that could be developed.	Reject	Section 12
719	S209.001	Tom Kennedy	Residential Zones	Support in part	Suggest a phased approach to high density residential areas.	They would expand slowly out from the city centre where the impact on existing neighbourhoods is acceptable and the residents in the neighbourhood have input into the final design and position of the development. i.e. It is not solely a decision based on market availability of land. The existing map showing the area of high density housing is too broad brush. Neighbourhoods in this area need to have input into redrawing the boundaries and identify suitable sites for 6 storey buildings.	Reject	Section 10
720	S209.002	Tom Kennedy	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Oppose] 6 story buildings on the west side of Harper Street. My concern is with High Density Residential Zone boundaries.	The impact on the ambience of the street would be devastating . There are a number of sites closer to the city centre where 6 storey buildings could be built without impact on the existing nature of the neighbourhood. I can imagine a situation where the position of a new 6 storey building is random and only dependent on the agreement of the existing land owner to sell. As long as the developer satisfied the new plan requirements then there would be no recourse of near by residents to restrict the height of the building.	Reject	Section 12
721	S211.001	Elisa Raabe	Mapping	Oppose	Remove Tāhunanui Hills from the proposed high-density zone.	Local geotechnical assessments It is our understanding that the majority of the Tahunanui Hills properties in the proposed high-density zone have a condition (Condition 1) on their title with the council. Condition 1 states that the land may be of suspect stability and conditions must be in place including geotechnical reports for any developments. This has resulted in several geotechnical reports being completed already in the area proposed for high-density zoning, with some sections not able to be developed even for single-story residential homes due to the risk. Infrastructure servicing for high-density development The Tāhunanui Hills is serviced by narrow, winding streets which in our opinion are inappropriate to service high traffic volumes. NCC recently installed speed bumps along Tosswill Road to slow down traffic which uses this road as a thoroughfare to and from Nelson City. The road is very narrow and from our time living here, we have seen a number of incidents and near misses due to the narrow winding nature of the road where cars often cross the centre line. In addition, accessing Tāhunanui Drive from Tosswill Road can be very difficult and dangerous and would need significant upgrading before this scale of development could be accommodated on the hill. We consider that the potential traffic produced by high-density development in this area has not been considered in enough detail as to whether it is appropriate. The same is likely for other infrastructure provisions to the area, such as Three Waters servicing. There are a number of reoccurring slip zones onto Tosswill Rd that make it even more dangerous. Nelson City Council planning team response We have discussed the proposed zoning with the NCC planning team who said that the Tāhunanui Hills were chosen for the	Accept in part	Section 12

722	FS61.064	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Remove Tāhunanui Hills from the proposed high-density zone. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- In agreement that Tahunanui hillsides are inappropriate for HDZ	Accept in part	Section 12
723	FS72.068	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Remove Tāhunanui Hills from the proposed high-density zone. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- In agreement that Tahunanui hillsides are inappropriate for HDZ.	Accept in part	Section 12
724	FS60.060	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Remove Tāhunanui Hills from the proposed high-density zone. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- In agreement that Tahunanui hillsides are inappropriate for HDZ.	Accept in part	Section 12
725	S212.001	Steve Day	Residential Zones	Oppose	Decline the plan change [inferred].	The impact on neighboring property and impact on Nelson. The submitter has experienced health problems that they attribute to the 3 story apartment building on the north side obscuring winter sun to their unit. Also there was no privacy as property was very overlooked. Concerns regarding infrastructure, flooding, water supply & parking. [Allowing high density housing] risks creating social housing ghettos similar to Housing NZ properties of the past.	Reject	Section 12
726	S213.001	Kylie Young	Residential Zones	Oppose	Stop Plan [Change] 29.	I disagree with Plan 29. I do not want home owners to lose their valuable daylight and sunshine on their properties. Putting 3-6 story buildings is ridiculous. We will lose what makes Nelson a special place to live and bring up our families.	Reject	Section 9
727	S214.001	Valerie Horder	Entire Plan Change	Support	[Approve] the plan change.	Reasons for wanting to support plan 29. It will provide more housing and warmer dryer new housing for the increasing population. This will bring more people to the inner city which in turn will help retail and hospitality to thrive and bring vibrancy to the city. There will be more choice in the type of accommodation. ie townhouse and apartment living. People able to live near where they work . Able to walk and bike to work and shop etc. Public transport will become more viable. Better environmentally. More rates will provide more funding for amenities and infrastructure. Happy that heritage is protected in the plan. Happy that hazards are in the plan to control building in unsuitable areas. Overall very supportive of the plan for the reasons above.	Accept	Section 9
728	S215.001	Andrew Huffam	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Withdraw the plan change] until a better thought out alternative can be made and put out for public consultation, [including amendments to the plan to:	The reasons are as follows for my Opposition to plan 29 and keeping medium and high density to new subdivisions and the CBD: Nelson CBD is very under used with a lot of old buildings and empty sites that would benefit from upgrades and while still having retail on the lower levels upper levels can be used as rental and privately own apartments which I'm sure can be made to even taller than six story high density. Only new subdivision should be subject to Medium and High Density zoning as it makes it all the same for everybody in that area having a less negative effect on surrounding neighbours properties. - Medium and High Density will effect the efficiency of current solar options that property owners have installed on single story houses making higher living costs and a longer return on investment in their choice of solar options. -Medium and High Density will negatively effect one story properties sun light hours making un heathy damp and cold especially over the winter months and less enjoyable to be outside in summer with neighbours being able to look over fence reducing current property owners privacy to be outside. - Existing properties valuations will be affected by having medium and high density building constructed next door to them and will be harder to sell. - Construction should be moved further from the boundary as Plan Change 29 I feel is to close to the neighbouring property. - Extra water flow from new developments will cause flooding in neighbouring properties and street flooding as the water will have less places to go with more concrete and asphalt surfaces not allowing the water to penetrate the ground.	Reject	Section 9

729	S216.006	Cathie Fearey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Require] assurance that utilities and services can cope with the increased demand on infrastructure for increased housing in any area, both infill and new build.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
730	S216.007	Cathie Fearey	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Consider creating a purpose-built town from the ground up with the necessary services and infrastructure included.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 12
731	S218.001	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject notified plan change 29.	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 9
732	S218.003	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Inner City and City Fringe Zones	Oppose	Contain high rise construction to within the CBD.	The highest buildings in Nelson are the Rutherford Hotel and the Council building, both within the CBD area. Any such high rise construction as proposed in Plan 29 should be contained within the CBD area where there already a number of vacant spaces.	Accept in part	Section 12
733	S218.005	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Extend the closing date for submissions] and hold a series of community based public meetings with the Mayor and Planners.	We also strongly feel that the currently proposed consultation period is totally inadequate as are any steps taken to ensure that the wider community are well informed via a concerted consultative process... Surely, such a major change this warrants a consultative process that is similarly the biggest we have ever seen and far more comprehensive than is currently proposed with just over five week open for review and submissions. At the very least this should comprise a series of community based public meetings with the Mayor and Planners. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
734	S218.006	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Appoint a hearings panel with] the majority comprised of independent commissioners.	The decision-making process needs to be democratic and balanced. We understand that the currently proposed hearings panel will have a majority of NCC councilors as members. Clearly, for a fair analysis, the majority of this panel should comprise a majority of independent commissioners.	Reject	Section 13
735	FS5.008	Warwick Rogers		Support	Accept	The process is so far has been extremely flawed and unfair and undemocratic. The two councilors making up 2/3rds of the panel have already declared their support in full for PC29. How can this even be considered?	Reject	Section 13
736	S218.007	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	As we understand, the Plan 29 change is required to accommodate potentially massive population growth, forecasting 27% by 2050, but the reality is the most recent reports tells a different story... The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
737	S218.009	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

738	S218.011	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S218.010.	Reject	Section 13
739	S218.015	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
740	S218.016	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	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 12
741	FS28.010	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 in part	Section 12
742	S218.018	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
743	S218.023	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S218.010 and S218.016.	Reject	Section 13
744	S218.024	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
745	S218.031	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[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
746	S218.033	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

747	S218.034	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
748	S219.001	Pritesh Mandaliya	Entire Plan Change	Support	[Proceed] with Plan Change 29.	I Support the new proposed change 29. I am living in Nelson from past 11 years and I got 7 Properties in Nelson. I have done 2 subdivisions. As being a landlord for 7 properties. I see a real demand in more housing in Nelson. Rent is going up wards only because there are not many properties on the market. And we really don't have much flat land in Nelson. But there are many properties on good size section which can be subdivided to add more houses. But after doing 2 subdivision I found it very hard and costly to deal with the whole process. Council should definitely encourage people like me to try to add more house stock in Nelson and the only way we can do it if there is a easy process and numbers works out to do so. I am very happy that council is looking I right direction. We need more house in Nelson and change 29 way is a good start. We need to think long terms and Nelson is getting more popular for people to migrate to. I myself came from Auckland 11 years ago and have to plan to move out of Nelson.	Accept	Section 9
749	S220.001	Phillipa Stark	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject totally PC29].	I reject totally [PC29]. A one size fits all cities (see the original inclusion of part of the Tahuna slip area) and the destruction of established neighbourhoods will be a blight on Nelson. For example Rutherford St. is already heavily populated. Most properties have already three houses, and very little precious green soak areas. These were built at current regulations of 6 metres between structures and with preservation of all-important daylight angles. Any intensification with blocks of apartments would completely overwhelm the neighbourhood, and drastically devalue existing houses. The loss of sun and daylight angles alone would completely devastate neighbourhoods. Recently local heavy flooding has been a problem, with inadequate drainage due to current housing density, and which will increase with threatened weather patterns. Also there have been problems with sewerage, and for which no council maps exist. If you propose to put the onus on contractors to provide these amenities, the resulting cost of apartments would skyrocket. The absence of parking places will not reduce traffic congestion.	Reject	Section 12
750	S221.001	Damian Roughan	Residential Zones	Amend	[Request] that such buildings be constructed against a significantly rising backdrop, [such as] Washington Valley, West Wood area, and West Victory area.	More intensive hous[ing] makes good use of space and infrastructure. However, structures over two storeys [will] block sun and natural light. [Regarding affordability, more intensive housing will create] more houses that are available for sale [which] may have a moderating effect on price, however, this is a long game scenario. Positioning multi-storey dwellings [in the locations identified will] not deprive sun from neighbouring properties [and will increase housing supply].	Reject	Section 12
751	S221.002	Damian Roughan	Residential Zones	Amend	[Request] that such buildings be constructed against a significantly rising backdrop, [such as] Washington Valley, West Wood area, and West Victory area.	Refer to reasons in submission point S221.001.	Reject	Section 12

752	S221.003	Damian Roughan	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Recommend that land be made available for long term rental at reasonable rates (not market rate) so that people can build their own houses.	My second concern is around the cost of housing. Creating social stability, educational stability for children and a sense of belonging and pride in the place they call home. Crime states from transient and unlocated members of Aotearoa compared to those of home owners would not insignificantly indicate that stability supports peace and not crime. It would seem to me that local and central government can at the stroke of a pen change the value of land. This of course is usually to increase it's value, so could there be a reverse.	Reject	Section 12
753	S222.004	Lesley Kotua	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 S222.001. Don't build huge or high complexes on/in areas that have established residential houses, we know this because we live [near] Franklyn Village (it doesn't work). There are some nice practical units being built on Main Road, Stoke.	Accept in part	Section 12
754	S222.006	Lesley Kotua	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S222.001 and S222.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
755	S222.007	Lesley Kotua	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
756	S222.008	Lesley Kotua	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
757	S226.004	Nigel and Angela Tideman	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 S226.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
758	S226.006	Nigel and Angela Tideman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones. Build multi storey buildings in Nelson City and also tear down some of the older buildings in Tahuna near the beach and build apartments there.	Refer to reasons in submission points S226.001 and S226.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
759	S226.007	Nigel and Angela Tideman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
760	S226.008	Nigel and Angela Tideman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
761	S227.004	Sophia Katsoulis	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 S227.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
762	S227.006	Sophia Katsoulis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones. [Prioritise] inner city developments.	Refer to reasons in submission points S227.001 and S227.004 above. As somebody who is considering relocating to Nelson in the near future, the proposed changes under PC29 would deter me from my decision. The plan detracts from the appeals of Nelson as a prospective future for me as a young person looking to move away from the environment of larger cities.	Accept in part	Section 12
763	S227.007	Sophia Katsoulis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
764	S227.008	Sophia Katsoulis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
765	S228.004	Derek Gray	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 S228.001. Existing homeowners should not be disadvantaged by such proposed developments.	Accept in part	Section 12

766	S228.006	Derek Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S228.001 and S228.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
767	S228.007	Derek Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
768	S228.008	Derek Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
769	S229.004	Hamish Sellers	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 S229.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
770	S229.006	Hamish Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones. [Prioritise] inner city developments.	Refer to reasons in submission points S229.001 and S229.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
771	S229.007	Hamish Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
772	S229.008	Hamish Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
773	S230.004	Steven Judge	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 S230.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
774	S230.006	Steven Judge	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones. High density zone in the CBD. 3 storey and more to go into CBD.	Refer to reasons in submission points S230.001 and S230.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
775	S230.007	Steven Judge	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
776	S230.008	Steven Judge	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
777	S230.012	Steven Judge	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	No houses to be built on existing green space.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
778	S230.014	Steven Judge	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	All social housing [in residential zones] needs to be a mix of 1, 2, and 3 bedroom units.	So [there is] a mix of people on site, single, families, etc.	Reject	Section 13
779	S231.001	Greg West	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the Plan Change.	I/We own a property on Vanguard Street we would like to be able to build a 1bd studio/cottage on the front part of our section - so that we can stay there when we come to Nelson (It is quite separate from the house) alternatively a 'granny' flat footprint. Naturally it would require consents for amenities i.e. water, sewage, power.	Accept in part	Section 11
780	S232.001	Tony Pearson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Not stated.	The Government changed the law to allow housing NZ land exemption from Council control to the use of that land. That took away the rights of all New Zealanders to control their towns and cities development. Now if this change in the law re Council Plan Change 29 goes ahead then the construction companies will get the same right which removes te protection of light angles which will devalue homes which will increase the need for extra heating, which increases the carbon footprint of that house. Also the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act on Land owners have a right by law to have continuous and undisturbed enjoyment of their land.	Reject	Section 13
781	S233.003	Joan Skurr	Entire Plan Change	Amend	[Require] all new buildings [to] incorporate solar panels (especially commercial buildings).	Nelson is fortunate to receive abundant sunshine hours. I believe that all new buildings should incorporate solar panels (especially commercial buildings) to take advantage of this for their daily use.	Reject	Section 13

782	S233.004	Joan Skurr	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Encourage increased use of vegetation in the streets and on the new buildings.	Plants grow well here, and I would like to see Nelson as a city, encourage increased use of vegetation in the streets and on the new buildings.	Reject	Section 11
783	S233.006	Joan Skurr	Entire Plan Change	Amend	[Consult with] town planners and architects to make the best use of low carbon materials and good design features during the inital stages of [the] design process of all taller buildings [and make] publishing plans to inform the public, consultation, and (possible) mediation [mandatory].	For Nelson to retain and enhance its reputation as an attractive place to live and visit, I also propose that town planners and architects be consulted to make the best use of low carbon materials and good design features during the initial stages of design processes of all the taller buildings, and that publishing plans to inform the public be mandatory, along with consultation and possible mediation. Some Trafalgar Street frontages, replacing older facades which were earthquake risks, have been designed to retain historical characteristics. Those that have not been designed similarly do not fit in to the streetscape.	Reject	Section 13
784	S233.007	Joan Skurr	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Employ the equivalent of an independent Investigating Officer to consult with those affected by a planned development to produce satisfactory outcomes and maybe compromises.	Plan 29 lays out the way the Council intends densification to proceed on a case by case basis, without previous discussion with those affected. I propose that the Council employ the equivalent of an independent Investigating Officer to consult with those affected by a planned development to produce satisfactory outcomes and maybe compromises. This could prevent litigation.	Reject	Section 13
785	S235.003	Kathryn Basalaj	Residential Zones	Oppose	Build in areas specifically designed for new housing such as Berryfields.	Refer to reasons in submission point S235.001.	Reject	Section 12
786	S237.001	Cynthia Sowman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Consider] a village just for the elderly.	Would have loved to have seen a Village just for the elderly - they also have had hardship in their lives so deserve a safe haven in their twilight years.	Reject	Section 10
787	S237.002	Cynthia Sowman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend Kainga Ora's policy regarding troublesome tenants].	My major concern and my family is Safety, now in the process of installing security doors which I hate the thought of but since hearing that the Kainga Ora have a policy of NOT evicting tenants if they become troublesome - that terrifies me! [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
788	S239.004	Kyra Wilkie	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 S239.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
789	S239.006	Kyra Wilkie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S239.001 and S239.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
790	S239.007	Kyra Wilkie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
791	S239.008	Kyra Wilkie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
792	S239.012	Kyra Wilkie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use uninhabited buildings in Central Nelson, e.g. Time Zone building.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
793	S240.004	Peter Wilkie	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 S240.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
794	S240.006	Peter Wilkie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S240.001 and S240.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
795	S240.007	Peter Wilkie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
796	S240.008	Peter Wilkie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13

797	S241.004	Amanda Dykzeul	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 S241.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
798	S241.006	Amanda Dykzeul	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S241.001 and S241.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
799	S241.007	Amanda Dykzeul	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
800	S241.008	Amanda Dykzeul	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
801	S242.004	Greg and Amanda Dykzeul	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 S242.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
802	S242.006	Greg and Amanda Dykzeul	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S242.001 and S242.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
803	S242.007	Greg and Amanda Dykzeul	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
804	S242.008	Greg and Amanda Dykzeul	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
805	S244.001	Carolyn Marshall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	I reject PC29 in its entirety. [The following is a summary of the key reasons described in the submission], refer to the original submission for more detail: [The] increase in stress given that it becomes possible for the development of a high rise type of building next door/in the neighbourhood with no consultation. [The] Council has seemed to ignore the well-being of its citizens by its current plan proposal. [There is] potential for developer-led high rise buildings leading to a degraded skyline quite out of character. One of the attractions of Nelson [is] its sunshine. It seems ludicrous that [the] plan [will] potentially affect the amount of sunlight a neighbouring property could receive [when] people have bought their properties under current rules including daylight angles.	Reject	Section 9
806	FS5.019	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 9
807	S244.002	Carolyn Marshall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council to withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions. Or preferably re-think the approach and consider far more comprehensive neighbourhood plans and consultation.	It has been stated at numerous meetings "This is a 'Broad Brush approach' that requires public submissions to refine the plan". Such a statement implies PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it.	Reject	Section 13
808	S244.003	Carolyn Marshall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Request that] Council lead the way in showing a long term development plan into which developers fit rather than letting developers [lead]. Areas for development need to be identified on an urban block by block approach and then that information needs to be communicated to residents of Nelson.	I support intensification and oppose the endless green fields development which has characterised expansion but strongly believe that planning is essential to prevent a hotch potch approach. Nelson is a 'Low Rise' City with a collection of heritage and non-heritage character buildings that have attracted people for generations.	Accept in part	Section 13

809	S244.004	Carolyn Marshall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Appoint an] Urban Development Agency which identifies suitable areas for intensification and which has a long term view.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S244.003.	Reject	Section 13
810	S244.006	Carolyn Marshall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification, [starting with] the inner city, with the city fringe areas being next.	Council should look at progressively phasing in intensification - e.g. the inner city, which is perhaps the most obvious place to start where 6 storey buildings may not look totally out of place. The concept of a commercial ground floor (retaining current facades and character where possible) with residential upper floors is a popular idea being mooted by many. Potentially developing the inner city first will 'mop up' anticipated demand (and there appears to be some question mark over predicted figures based on Stats NZ) - possibly for some decades to come. This has a benefit that it will give far more time for a cohesive and well thought out plan (neighbourhood plans) which identifies other suitable areas - with city fringe areas being the next obvious target area(s).	Reject	Section 13
811	S244.008	Carolyn Marshall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Utilise the] expertise of urban planners and architects to come up with innovative and attractive solutions.	I fully support submissions such as that presented by Architect William Samuels. Intensify by design rather than developers.	Accept in part	Section 12
812	S244.009	Carolyn Marshall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] the Council to appoint Councillors from either side of the Sept 14th vote, and if [that] is not followed, then I [request] that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	I strongly disagree with the make-up of the hearing panel, because of its 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
813	S246.004	Connie Sellers	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 12m as it is not mandated under NPS-UD 2020. Refer to reasons in submission point S246.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
814	S246.006	Connie Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S246.001 and S246.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
815	S246.007	Connie Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
816	S246.008	Connie Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
817	S246.009	Connie Sellers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Create an Urban Development Agency to provide a vision for future development in Nelson.	I am concerned about any overall vision as to how Nelson will look in the future as this will currently be left to developers.	Reject	Section 13

818	S247.001	David Turpin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose Plan Change 29 and come up a new plan which protects Nelson as a city and also allows for increased housing, but done in the right way.	Main reason is that the negative effects of such a drastic high intensification plan will reduce the overall feel and attraction of Nelson city. The possibility of increased housing will be more negative of the residents of Nelson then positive by the way of loss of sunlight, increased vehicles on the streets, loss of historic buildings and beautiful districts. Overall loss of attraction for people to come to Nelson. I am all for intensifying Nelson where needed, but it must all take into account the Vibe and feel which Nelson has. This is what makes it such an attractive city to start with. We must not loose this. I am unsure why the council believes that we need to put such drastic measure in place, relaxing restrictions and expanding such high density development to residential areas. Especially since we have such large areas which can easily be developed in the city centre and city fringe. We have multiple large car yards within the city. If there was such a high demand to develop inner city units and complex's, these parcels of land would be far too valuable to remain car yards and would be developed into housing which you believe we need. The negative effects of Plan29 far outweigh the positive effects in my view. The lack of privacy with high rise units looking directly into people's private property. We have a very very small city, a population of 55k people. Our public transport is shocking and that's understandable with such small numbers. But our projected growth is not big enough to warrant lack of parking for residents and ugly extremely high density blocks in residential neighbourhoods. The high density buildings will cause major issues with parking and huge increases in traffic on those streets making it dangerous for children and walkers and pets. Especially residential streets like mine which	Accept in part	Section 12
819	S247.013	David Turpin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Have all three panel members to be independent and not associated with the NCC.	I also feel that it's is a strong conflict of interest that two of the appointed panel members are two councillors who are openly pro plan29.	Reject	Section 13
820	S250.001	Amy Russ	Mapping	Oppose	[Oppose] the High Density Residential zone and the potential for multi-storey multi-story units to be built alongside single-storyhomes.	At this stage we have a lovely three-bedroom single story home on our western side that was built in a similar era, with a similar garden. Behind us we have the same. If these were to be removed and multi-story units put in its place, this would be extremely upsetting to us and would severely impact the way we live and go about our daily business. Our street is narrow, and already a hazard for school children, general pedestrians, and cyclists, especially during school drop-off and pick-up times as it is used as a throughfare between Nayland Road and shortcut access to the supermarkets. The effect that high density housing would have on our street is dramatic, even without factoring in the need for parking. The infrastructure would have to change drastically to accommodate these changes. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
821	S250.005	Amy Russ	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose] the way in which Plan 29 has been conducted and the lack of clear information provided to the homeowners.	My family does NOT support the way in which Plan 29 has been conducted and the lack of clear information provided to the homeowners, nor do we feel there has been much thought put into the effects upon people's mental health that the stress of these uncertainties has inflicted.	Reject	Section 13

822	S254.001	Jane and Benjamin Gass	Mapping	Oppose	[Amend] the [zoning of] central Stoke from High Density to Medium Density.	We do not support the residential zone in the plan change for Stokes Central. High Density Residential Housing is not appropriate for Stoke. Stoke as a residential community with commercial businesses catering for essential needs eg chemist, supermarkets, cafes etc. It is not a commercial hub like Nelson and Richmond. Many of its residents living in and around Stoke Central are elderly, living in grouped housing. And so it's nice they can easily [and] safely access these businesses and amenities e.g. library and community centre. Bus services are also readily available if residents wish to go to the commercial centres of Nelson and Richmond. High Density Zoning will increase the number of people but not necessarily increase commercial ventures. The New Junction complex and Annesbrook, opening soon, will affect this. The increase in population will also decrease safety of movement of elderly and young people around Stoke. I have seen this first hand in a small centre in Germany.	Accept in part	Section 12
823	S254.002	Jane and Benjamin Gass	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Not stated.	We support plan change 29. Intensification is necessary for Nelson and surrounding areas.	Accept	Section 9
824	S255.001	Kathleen Newth	Mapping	Oppose	Amend Plan Change 29 to remove high density zones from the Stoke area. Either replace these zones with a medium density classification or totally revisit and reclassify.	I oppose Plan Change 29 for the Stoke area. The planned high density (up to six stories) is not in keeping with the local Village character. We should not have any developments higher than 3 stories. The most obvious development plan for Stoke on the "Whareama" site would totally destroy the village area if 6 stories are allowed to be built.	Reject	Section 13
825	S256.004	Diana Fors	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 S256.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
826	S256.006	Diana Fors	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones. Think carefully about how this plan will impact on our neighbourhoods outside of the inner city.	Refer to reasons in submission points S256.001 and S256.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
827	S256.007	Diana Fors	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
828	S256.008	Diana Fors	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
829	S258.001	Sarah Rapsey	Mapping	Oppose in part	[Request] the residential areas of Stoke are not high or medium density.	The residential areas of Stoke should not be high or medium density. Six stories high makes sense only in the CBD and three stories high makes sense for around the City areas, but not in areas such as flat areas of Stoke.	Accept in part	Section 12

830	S259.001	Shelagh Noble	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw the residential provisions of Plan Change 29; and prepare a variation based on matters raised in my detailed submission. This should include a more fine-grained character analysis.	I support in principle, provisions that would allow, enable and encourage more dwellings within the existing residential areas, however the extent of the proposed zoning and zoning rules are not adequately supported by the analysis in the section 32 Evaluation Report and Appendices. Additional reasons include: 1. It is unlikely that a developer would construct a six storey building for only 3 dwellings - therefore there is no need for a 'permitted' category in any High Density zone. 2. The proposed High Density zones surrounding Nelson City were not part of the previously consulted Whakatu Nelson Plan (now on hold). 3. The Urban Design analysis by Barker & Associates is based solely on proximity to the Central Business District, hence justifying the extension of the High Density zone. Council has undertaken a thorough hazard analysis, and a heritage study to exclude some residential areas from the Medium and High Density zones, but no 'character analysis' of these areas has been done. 4. This 'Planned Built Character' simply suggests that the character of a Medium Density area is 3 storeys and a High Density area is 6 storeys. I suggest this is NOT the desired character of the areas proposed for these zones. 5. The current standards for daylight admission in the Nelson Resource Management Plan are well-researched and tested. 6. I argue strongly that the risk analysis is inadequate. 7. There is no consideration in the section 32 Evaluation of the non- notification provisions that are in Plan Change 29. 8. And finally, with increasing density one would expect increasing storm water. Some analysis of storm water neutrality is missing from the plan change proposal. {Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
831	FS65.054	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: Withdraw the residential provisions of Plan Change 29; and prepare a variation based on matters raised in my detailed submission. This should include a more fine-grained character analysis. Submission refers to need for more work on heritage and character analysis. 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 in part	Section 12
832	FS78.011	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Support some level of intensification but analysis and provisions are flawed, community had not been consulted on this level of density. This is not sustainable, precautionary planning. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PPC29 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 12
833	FS78.075	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Withdraw the residential provisions of Plan Change 29; and prepare a variation based on matters raised in our detailed submission. This should include a more fine-grained character analysis. Submission refers to need for more work on heritage and character analysis. 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 in part	Section 12

834	S259.002	Shelagh Noble	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	If Council wishes to achieve more dwellings, Council can do a number of things: for example, waive fees on medium and high density resource consents; increase rates on valuable underutilised land that would be appropriate for high density; and waive development contributions. However, such proposals should be consented provided the rules are appropriate - be granted as Controlled Development without full or limited notification.	These actions would incentivise dwelling conversions, encourage better use of large sites, and help target sites for higher density development.	Accept	Section 9
835	FS78.012	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Support some level of intensification but analysis and provisions are flawed, community had not been consulted on this level of density. This is not sustainable, precautionary planning. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PPC29 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 12
836	S259.003	Shelagh Noble	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Support the placement of a notice on a property where a resource consent has been lodged.	So that neighbours are kept informed, may view proposals and even provide comment, should timeframes allow, however this is suggested as an informal process and would not trigger extensive submissions and an expensive hearing process. This is a common practice in other countries, and is not mandated in the RMA. There is nothing preventing Council from adopting such a strategy.	Reject	Section 13
837	FS78.013	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Support some level of intensification but analysis and provisions are flawed, community had not been consulted on this level of density. This is not sustainable, precautionary planning. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. PPC29 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 1
838	S260.001	Rikki-Lee Hanna	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support housing intensification.	I am completely in support of housing intensification, it's necessary for sustainable development. Furthermore nelson comparatively to the rest of the world is such a small city, this proves a fairly unique opportunity in the 21 century to be able to design a beautiful prosperous city. Using the Dutch as an example of well done intensification, imagine what they could've done if they were only 200 years into their urban development.	Accept in part	Section 9
839	S260.003	Rikki-Lee Hanna	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Require new builds for intensification purposes to be biophilic by design.	It's a fact that people suffer when they don't have access to nature, we know that it harms indigenous communities and being able to allow endemic species to thrive in our city would make it magic. (Plus big apartment buildings that aren't designed functionally and beautifully are terrible to look at and you'll never get community buy in it they're sterile and hideous).	Reject	Section 10
840	S262.004	Sarah Digges La Touche	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 S262.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
841	S262.006	Sarah Digges La Touche	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S262.001 and S262.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12

842	S262.007	Sarah Digges La Touche	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
843	S262.008	Sarah Digges La Touche	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
844	S263.001	Lynden Penketh	Mapping	Oppose	[Amend] the High-density areas surrounding the Stoke town/shopping centre to Medium-density of up to three storeys.	I oppose six-storey developments in Stoke as they would not be n keeping with the village suburb. Of particular, and most immediate concern, is my understanding that the Whareama Hospital site could be developed up to six stories if Plan Change 29 proceeds	Reject	Section 13
845	S264.004	Dharan Longley	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 S264.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
846	S264.006	Dharan Longley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S264.001 and S264.004 above. Council should allocate inner city buildings for intensification only and not ruin existing neighbourhoods with completely inappropriate high rise buildings.	Accept in part	Section 12
847	S264.007	Dharan Longley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
848	S264.008	Dharan Longley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
849	S264.009	Dharan Longley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29 and consult with Nelson residents to develop new plan].	The whole "plan" needs to be thrown out and rethought entirely. Council must consult all Nelson residents then incorporate all their wishes and objections into a new plan that does not impose on existing single or two storey homes [with] these absurd 3 to 6 storey high-rise 'intensive' structures. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
850	S266.004	Luke Slotemaker	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 S266.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
851	S266.006	Luke Slotemaker	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S266.001 and S266.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
852	S266.007	Luke Slotemaker	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
853	S266.008	Luke Slotemaker	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
854	S267.002	Richard Morris	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject] Plan Change 29.	Multi Storey developments in an already developed area will seriously detract from the open and pleasant aspect of Nelson and overshadow a great deal of private property - including the use of solar power and blighting its otherwise amenable situation. The effects of dense population are properly described by the work of Dr. Calhoun and it is particularly relevant with International figures supporting his findings. It does not take long to find out that high density living brings more social problems, criminal activities and an increase in violence, further exacerbating the infrastructure shortage (again this is backed up by Government statics). Having lived for over 50 years in such conditions it is clear that the proposers of the 'Plan' have no idea of the mess their intentions will create.	Reject	Section 12
855	S267.003	Richard Morris	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Prioritise] use of existing Council and privately owned properties.	It is a fact that there are empty Council controlled as well as private residential properties and commercial premises. How can that be when pressure is on for accommodation?	Reject	Section 12
856	S268.004	Richard Palmer	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 S268.001.	Accept in part	Section 12

857	S268.006	Richard Palmer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S268.001 and S268.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
858	S268.007	Richard Palmer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
859	S268.008	Richard Palmer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
860	S268.009	Richard Palmer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Support intensive development within area described].	I would be in general agreement and support intensive development of the inner city, especially the area north of Nile St to the Maitai River, Rutherford St East along Halifax St to the River, and a line along Alton St to Nile St. There are many areas within these boundaries that can and should support intensive housing development. Bring life back to the inner city, get rid of the old buildings and tidy the inner city up.	Accept in part	Section 12
861	S269.003	Lew Metcalfe	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	PC29 should be withdrawn and good community engagement and neighbourhood planning completed before it is re-notified in the future. If substantial changes occur to PC29 as a result of the submission / hearing / decision process then PC29 should be withdrawn and re-drafted.	I am strongly opposed to all of the proposed policies and rules in PC29. As a result of attendance at some of the PC29 public meetings, it is clear that many residents, particularly near the Inner-city zone, are very concerned about PC29. This is indicative of the public fear PC29 has generated because: It is a large and complex Plan Change that requires a high level of knowledge to understanding and to interpret what the implications are for individuals and Nelson city as a whole. The meetings are well attended because a large number of residents, who currently enjoy the close proximity to the city centre, are 'captured' by the proposed High Density Residential Zone (HRZ). Residents sense that the value of their homes and life savings is potentially at risk and their overall social well-being such as their loss of privacy, loss of sunlight, loss of community, loss of mental well-being, loss of parking and the like are at risk. Residents believe that these closely held social and amenity values are at risk of being lost. This is based on an overall understanding that the proposed PC29Policies and the Permitted and Restricted Discretionary rules are designed to encourage the construction of multi-storey residential buildings in an un-planned, un-disciplined and random manner within the HRZ. The Policies and Rules allow limited opportunity for the community to be consulted. There is virtually no neighbourhood or community planning (a tool that the FDS identifies as a primary means to ensure good urban design occurs) about where to best locate such developments. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

862	S269.004	Lew Metcalfe	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] Policies and Rules must reflect the interim and short-term (10 year) position and demand / capacity analysis rather than a 30 year long term time-frame.	The s32 report (section 1.3) states that PC29 is an "interim response while the Draft Nelson Plan is on hold, in recognition that housing supply and affordability is a critical issue within Nelson. A full plan review will be progressed once the new legislation, the Natural and Built Environment Act (NBEA) and Spatial Planning Act (SPA) are in place." PC29 proposes a significant change to the existing policies and rules in the NRMP that has the potential to affect the largest investment many residents in the Medium Density residential Zone (MRZ) have, being their home. The changes are designed to enable housing intensification for the long term (at least until 2051) which does not reflect an "interim response". Nor is it appropriate that the policies and rules should be so substantial in the knowledge that "a full review" will be necessary in the near future. Intensification in the city centre will be a 'slow burning' incremental change. PC29 is a long term response rather than a short term one and in its current form is not supported by the analysis of the demand for such housing. There are better options available to achieve the FDS aims and to meet government legislation requirements while also hearing and integrating community feedback.	Reject	Section 10
863	S269.010	Lew Metcalfe	Residential Zones	Oppose	Neighbourhood planning, as referred to in the FDS, [should] be undertaken prior to PC29 becoming operative.	There is a lack of neighbourhood planning being applied as part of, or required by PC29 rules and policies, and I am unable to locate an annual FDS implementation plan which would guide a more incremental and effects-based approach. I understand that neighbourhood planning is intended to occur after PC29 is operative. Surely, once the rules and policies are established it seems difficult for neighbourhood planning to be of much value when the location of multi-storey buildings is entirely determined by a developer / applicant acquiring the land. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
864	S269.011	Lew Metcalfe	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Utilise the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy as the basis for developing suitable policies and rules for intensification].	I accept there is a need for more intensive residential housing development in central Nelson in order to provide for long term population growth but more importantly to help create a vibrant and more sustainable inner-city population. Appropriate planning policies and rules are necessary to achieve these aims. The Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 (FDS) provides a sound basis from which to develop suitable Policies and Rules. PC29 lacks the necessary evidence that PC29 will adequately address the most critical issue for Nelson being "housing ... affordability" as identified by the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 (FDS). Intensification is more likely to provide a greater range of housing options but the Plan Change s32 report fails to support the other principal aim of PC29 that by providing greater housing supply via increased housing intensification will result in greater "affordability". Affordability (ie: home ownership) is definitely less likely to be achieved especially in the current times of high costs of construction, high interest rates and overall high costs of living.	Reject	Section 12

865	S270.001	Nicola Horner	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose] Plan 29.	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 and I pray you do not. 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. All buildings should not be any higher then 2 stories, I lived in Margate, England there is a large building there called the Arlington House poking out of the beautiful sea side town of Margate, I think the ugliness of that building speaks for itself. Laws are there to protect everyone from any wrongdoing, but it is unnerving when laws to protect us are taken away or "changed" in this case. There would be no homeowner in the entire Nelson region that would want a three-story-plus building built beside them, taking away most or all of their sunlight, privacy, and views. Three stories built in our beautiful suburbs is too high, two stories would be the limit, as long as sunlight for surrounding neighbors' is considered. Common sense, thoughtfulness, and common courtesy might be too much to ask from the Nelson City Council for their ratepayers, but I have hope. Very concerned about our beautiful Nelson region.	Accept in part	Section 12
866	S270.003	Nicola Horner	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] do not leave the aesthetics of the suburb up to individual developer.	Do not leave the aesthetics of the suburb up to individual developer, they are just thinking of the money trying to build at the cheapest cost. It will give developers too much freedom to build whatever they want, with no thought to surrounding home owners; 3 stories is too high in a suburban area.	Reject	Section 9
867	S270.004	Nicola Horner	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Compensate home owners for the loss of property value they might occur, give heavy discounts in rates.	If all these submissions fall on deaf ears, I would expect all house owners to be given heavy discounts in Rates or even compensated for the loss of property value they might occur.	Reject	Section 11
868	S270.007	Nicola Horner	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 S270.006.	Accept in part	Section 12
869	S270.008	Nicola Horner	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
870	S270.009	Nicola Horner	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the Closing Date for Submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
871	S272.001	Bruno Allais	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose PC29.	PC29 has inappropriate and excessive regulation and a lack of progressive phases. The project is drawn without a quality of life plan nor a vision of an urban housing and architectural concept that are really committed the current climate issues. No infrastructure program accompanies it, no policy is announced to encourage social diversity in housing for intensification objective. No consideration is given to the current architectural and urban landscape. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
872	S272.002	Bruno Allais	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	{Amend the process] to firstly define the future we want before drafting regulations. [Consider] launching a competition of ideas on urban housing concepts.	There has been confusing and inadequate communication in relation to the ambitious challenges. Intensification is a necessity. But what kind of future do we want for our city? Plan Change 29 is currently presented without design. There are a few scattered intentions in the Plan Change, but they are very theoretical, often hollow and not very productive. A competition of ideas would would be a sound basis for reflection and a way of getting the public involved in a constructive debate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9

873	S272.003	Bruno Allais	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Restrict the necessary intensification only to the Mixed Use and Centre City zones of PC29.	Why not provide a better framework for this intensification by 2052 by means of a progressive project, stage by stage, zone by zone? With time between each stage to correct the objectives and concentrate the essential infrastructure efforts. Logically, the first stage should be restricted to the densification of the Mixed Use and Centre City zones. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
874	S274.001	Robert Renshaw	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S274.002. This plan is not for the benefit of Nelson, but for developers allowing them to build whatever they want with no consent or notification requirement to affected home owners. I believe there is plenty of opportunity for intensification without the need to change the current building rules.	Reject	Section 9
875	FS31.008	Stephen Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
876	FS72.008	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: reject PC29 in its entirety. This plan is out of step with the NZ Central Government's proposed plans for development. The NZ Government has indicated a lack of support for the previous Government's position on densification. Until more direction is given, this has the potential to be a waste of Council and Ratepayers' funds and time following an outdated Central Government brief. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
877	FS66.010	Carol Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
878	FS61.008	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
879	FS76.008	Robert Stevenson(1)		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13

880	FS54.008	Nicole Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
881	FS53.008	Susan Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
882	FS46.008	Dan McGuire		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
883	FS77.008	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
884	FS60.008	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
885	S274.002	Robert Renshaw	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
886	S274.003	Robert Renshaw	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13

887	S274.004	Robert Renshaw	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
888	S274.010	Robert Renshaw	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
889	S274.011	Robert Renshaw	Mapping	Oppose	Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district, on the basis that Daylight Admission protection rules will apply to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Refer to reasons in submission point S274.010.	Reject	Section 12
890	FS28.112	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district, on the basis that 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 in part	Section 12
891	S274.013	Robert Renshaw	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Form relationships with different communities and talk to the residents about what is best for the area. Form small groups for each area to have meetings with town planners to achieve the best outcomes for all.	To achieve the best outcomes for all.	Accept in part	Section 13
892	S274.019	Robert Renshaw	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Rezone Brook Valley to the General Residential Zone] as per decision requested in submission point S274.011.	Has any consideration been given to the lower Brook Valley area, which is shown on NCC hazard maps as being prone to both liquefaction and slope instability? The lower Brook Valley area is narrow and north facing. [It] is predominantly single storey houses with some two storey houses at the lower end. The nature of the valley with it being narrow does not lend itself to high rise buildings, which would not blend in with the environment and [would] have a big impact on many neighbouring properties, especially on the south side. Brook Valley residents have limited sunshine throughout the winter months due to hills on each side of the valley. Plan change 29 [would] allow buildings up to 11m +1m (3 storeys) 1m from rear boundaries [which] will block the sun completely for four months during the winter to any properties on their south side.	Accept	Section 12
893	S276.004	Jo Murphy	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 S276.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
894	S276.006	Jo Murphy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S276.001 and S276.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
895	S276.007	Jo Murphy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13

896	S276.008	Jo Murphy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
897	S277.001	Mark Newman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Decline the Plan Change.]	Papakainga-there is no need for racial discrimination. Land and transport - there is a need for parking requirements to stop on road congestion.	Reject	Section 9
898	S278.001	Paul Lunberg	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject the the Plan Change].	I do not believe we need to grow. We do not need any 'intensification of development' we actually need more parks and walkways. We need to be able to enjoy this lovely part of Aotearoa not some urban sprawl. The idea put forward in part 1 of the plan is totally contrary to the resident's wishes, we need to recognise that those of us who have made our life choices to live in this town should be listened to over the strident voices of developers who have no real interest in the lives of those already here. Section 2 has some emotive terms which help form the deceit inherent in this Plan - our city is already fairly well functioning! The truth is that further development will actually make it LESS well functioning. It is not based on improving life in our city - it is based on greed and thoughtlessness. I also believe making it so complicated to make submissions is undemocratic and poor governance.	Reject	Section 10
899	S279.001	Continuum Architects Ltd - Richard Sellars	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	Utilise scale models to 'test' 3D form effects in sepcific residential, Inner City and City fringe scenarios.	- words and diagrams are often difficult for many community members to understand. - simple, scale block models show immediate effects of form & daylight changes. - simple, scale block models (white cardboard, 3D printer?) illustrate, easily, the complex relationships between groups of buildings and the spaces around them. - models will assist in the evolution of site specific rules/guidelines, rather than a blanket 'one rule fits all' type of approach.	Reject	Section 9
900	S280.001	Nicola Gabelich	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject] Plan Change 29 in its entirety.	[Key reasons are grouped as follows - refer to the original submission for further details.] 1. Inconsistencies, confusion, short time frame and lack of notice in the consultation process. 2. Impact on amenity values 3. Congestion and parking issues 4. The chilling effect - sunlight and the impact on existing residents 5. Strain on infrastructure 6. Incorrect population statistics used. 7. Destruction of Heritage Value. 8. Bias on submission review panel 9 Correct zoning to revitalise our declining inner city.	Reject	Section 9
901	FS65.056	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support are: [Reject] Plan Change 29 in its entirety. Submitter refers to destruction of heritage value. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
902	FS78.077	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: [Reject] Plan Change 29 in its entirety. Submitter refers to destruction of heritage value. 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.	Reject	Section 12
903	S280.003	Nicola Gabelich	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Restrict] any high and medium density living (ie 3 units per site, dwellings 3 stories or higher) to the Mixed Use and Centre City zones already set out in the draft Whakamahere Whakatū Nelson Plan and leave the areas currently marked "high density and medium density" under PC 29 as they currently are.	Refer to reasons in submission point S280.001.	Accept in part	Section 12

904	S280.011	Nicola Gabelich	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose] 3 or 6 story high rise developments through our existing family neighbourhoods, especially without resource consent [and in the alternative support]] 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 commercial buildings. However I do not believe we should allow developers to build these.	Refer to reasons in submission point S280.001.	Reject	Section 13
905	S280.012	Nicola Gabelich	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Expand the hearings panel to a total of five, to include a further two independent representatives.	Bias on submission review panel It was raised at a public meeting that the proposed review panel is currently three people: two NCC councillors and one independent chair. It is my understanding that these two councillors have already voted in support of PC29. As a result this panel is unlikely to give a fair, and unbiased review of the process once submissions close, which is unacceptable. The panel should be expanded to a total of five, to include a further two independent representatives, to ensure quality, unbiased decisions are made on such an important issue.	Reject	Section 13
906	S282.001	Murray Lauchlan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Decline] Plan Change 29 in its entirety.	I do not believe the plan change appropriately addresses the needs for higher density housing in Nelson or the manner in which I want to see Nelson develop in the future with respect to the appearance of our residential housing areas. My main issue is around the height to which housing can be developed in the MDZ and HDZ zones.	Accept in part	Section 12
907	S284.001	Alison and David Mountfort	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29.	Our Submission concerns the area proposed to be zoned as Residential Medium Density (RMD), centred on Mount St, Konini St, Locking St and Wellington Streets Streets, between Kerr St in the north, Wellington St and Renwick Place to the east, Locking Tce and the walkway to Vanguard St to the south, and extending at several points to Vanguard St in the west. For convenience we will refer to this area as the Mount St Hill. The submission details why rezoning the above area is inappropriate, The key reasons include: - Insufficient roading and transport infrastructure. - Contribution of congestion on narrow roads. - Limited ability to contribute meaningfully to development capacity given development constraints presents, including steep topography. - Specific impacts on 83 Mount Street (the submitter's property). - Accessibility and safety impacts given the topography. Related issues for emergency access. - Particular transport impacts for Locking St and Konini St. - Impact on parking provision on street. - Suitability of intensification on steep erosion prone land. [Refer to the original submission for further detail.]	Accept in part	Section 12

908	S284.004	Alison and David Mountfort	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	That the Hearings Panel should have at least four and preferably five members with a quorum of three, and no more than one elected member.	We are concerned with both the size and makeup of the Hearings Panel. Because there will be many submissions it is likely that from time the elected members on the panel may know submitters personally, creating potential for conflicts of interest and a need to withdraw from the hearings on that matter. It is possible that sometimes only the independent panel member would be available to hear such a submission. Because of past decision making on the Future Development Strategy, both Councillors on the panel will have formed at least a preliminary opinion about the need for urban intensification in the form proposed. No doubt they would be able to change this mindset, but it may take more for them to do so than if they were to come to the case with no previous views. We also consider that the Nelson City Council has overstated the importance of local knowledge on the hearings panel. There are many highly qualified and experienced Hearings Commissioners in New Zealand who are able to come into a hearing from outside, and focus on the local issues of importance, guided by reporting officers and submitters. The issues in this case are not unique to Nelson. To us, it is much more important that the Commissioners have the training and experience to engage with technical experts and understand and apply technical expert considerations and evidence on technical subjects, including in this case traffic and geotechnical engineering.	Reject	Section 13
909	S284.005	Alison and David Mountfort	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	That the Hearings Panel conduct a thorough site inspection of the Mount St hill, including on foot, and that they refer to the photographs of Mount Street and Konini Street attached to the submission of Mr Steve Webster.	Refer to reasons in submission points in S284.001. For completeness we attach some photographs of Locking St, and a photograph of our own lane at 77-79 Mount St.	Reject	Section 12
910	S285.001	Hannah Douglas	Mapping	Oppose	[Request] Tosswill Road / Tamaki Street to not be included in the high density area due to land instability issues.	Slope instability. The high density area of Tosswill Road / Tamaki Street is located on known unstable land. It is reckless to consent to building six story properties on unstable land that has natural springs. There is already a huge land slide at the bottom of Tosswill Road that holds up the hillside where 6 story buildings could be built. This landslide does not need any more weight and loading added to it. When our neighbours across the road rebuilt using their old houses foundations, they had to spend an extra $250,000 due to new land slides on their property (this was before the big flooding in Nelson occured). Buildings of this size are better off suited on the flat like Muritai St that doesn't have slope instability. Proximity to key centres. Council wants to rezone this area due to its walking proximity to key centers. Tahunanui does not qualify in my opinion as a key centre, unlike Stoke and Town which I agree with. Tahunanui doesn't have a supermarket! Public transport and car parking. For houses located on Tosswill Road (for example 59 Tosswill Road) it is a 900m walk to the closest public transport and it takes 10 minutes. As part of this walk you need to cross the very busy state highway one. Tosswill Road already has very limited on street parking so where will people requiring a car park if developers do not include carparks? It is too dangerous to bike on Tosswill Road due to narrow streets and no bike lanes. High density housing maybe be better suited for Muritai Street that already has appropriate access to both bike lanes and public transport. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12

911	S285.004	Hannah Douglas	Mapping	Oppose	[Request both sides of Tosswill Road be] zoned the same.	We live on the higher side of Tosswill Road and are in the medium density zone. However, directly over the road from us is high density. We own two adjoining flat properties that would be perfect for building multiple three story town houses on. However we would never develop these properties if they are unable to get any view because the properties across the road are six storied and block out all our view and sun light. Both sides of the road should be medium density to allow everyone to access some of the view all the way up the hill. The only reason we purchased our home was because of the view and we subsequently paid a premium for it. Why on earth would you want to have all the hassles of living on the hill if you have no view? It makes no sense at all to have six story properties at the lower side of the hill and then the rest of the hill have no view at all. No one further up the hill will bother taking up the opportunity of developing if their view is gone or severely impacted by six story eyesores. This type of high density building is much better suited to Tahunanui flat where people can build up to get a view without sacrificing others views. The new apartments on Beach Road are a great example of this. The built up so that residents could get a view. However they are far enough away from the hill that it doesn't black anyone else's view significantly. I'd love to see more high intensity on the flat near the beach where it is far better suited. How can one side of Tosswill Road be classified as high density and the other side only be classified as medium density.	Accept	Section 12
912	FS61.065	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- How can one side of Tosswill Road be classified as high density and the other side only be classified as medium density. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- [Request both sides of Tosswill Road be] zoned the same. An example of the broad brush approach been done remotely behind a computer and not taking into account character of streetscape.	Accept in part	Section 12
913	FS72.069	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- How can one side of Tosswill Road be classified as high density and the other side only be classified as medium density. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- [Request both sides of Tosswill Road be] zoned the same. An example of the broad brush approach been done remotely behind a computer and not taking into account character of streetscape.	Accept in part	Section 12
914	FS60.061	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- How can one side of Tosswill Road be classified as high density and the other side only be classified as medium density. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- [Request both sides of Tosswill Road be] zoned the same. An example of the broad brush approach been done remotely behind a computer and not taking into account character of streetscape.	Accept in part	Section 12
915	S286.001	Gail Patrick	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reduce the High Density Residential zone and Medium Density Residential zone areas and allow 6 story only in current CBD.	- Concentrate on Bridge to Better then work outwards from there. - Build apartments on top of existing commercial. - Build apartments in Buxton carpark it's 8530sqm or similar Council owned properties. - An idea check https://ehaus.co.nz/project/dunedin-co-housing-project/ it took only 5000sqm. - The Population growth by Councils estimates until 2048 is 227pa that's about 100 new housing units so having CBD sprawl is a bad look when everyone wants sun and light filled homes. - Aging population and retirement villages like Coastal View will take many people from existing houses which will then cater for the pop growth expected.	Accept in part	Section 12

916	S287.004	Wendy Ford	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 S287.001. Building 3 storeys in residential areas is going to change small community neighbourhoods into faceless communities where neighbours won't know each others names.	Accept in part	Section 12
917	S287.006	Wendy Ford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S287.001 and S287.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
918	S287.007	Wendy Ford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
919	S287.008	Wendy Ford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
920	S287.010	Wendy Ford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Apply new rules to new subdivisions rather than existing neighbourhoods].	New subdivisions are the opportunity to easily apply new rules if required rather than desecrating existing neighbourhoods.	Reject	Section 12
921	S288.004	Savanna Lovesey	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 S288.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
922	S288.006	Savanna Lovesey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S288.001 and S288.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
923	S288.007	Savanna Lovesey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
924	S288.008	Savanna Lovesey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
925	S288.012	Savanna Lovesey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Encourage new subdivisions to decrease lot sizes and build 2 storeys.	Encourage new subdivisions to decrease lot sizes and build 2 storeys so more homes fit into the new areas.	Reject	Section 12
926	S289.004	Orlando Lovesey	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 S289.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
927	S289.006	Orlando Lovesey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S288.001 and S288.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
928	S289.007	Orlando Lovesey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
929	S289.008	Orlando Lovesey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
930	S290.001	Richard Watson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Stop Plan Change 29.	Existing homeowners will be severely disadvantaged by loss of privacy, light and loss of equity. These ratepayers bought properties under existing planning rules and it is totally wrong to now change the goalposts in a way which will dramatically change their lives.	Reject	Section 9
931	S290.003	Richard Watson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Allow more secondary dwellings on existing sections and encourage commercial and retail developments to include apartments on upper levels].	I think that a better solution would be to allow more secondary dwellings on existing sections and encourage commercial and retail developments to include apartments on upper levels.	Accept in part	Section 12

932	S292.001	Laura Wilson	Mapping	Oppose	[Request] no density zoning on Tamaki street.	We have purchased our house in the last 4 years with the proviso of the view. We have spent $100,000 on a large deck at the front of the house to utilise this view. The house is nothing exceptional, and without the view (due to a build in front of us) we would be both devastated and out of pocket with a reduction in house value. Alternatives would be to not include an area where house view is so important to the house value and house users. We also are a quiet cul de sac street, with surrounding privacy, high density zoning would significantly change this. We oppose the high density zoning on Tamaki Street (particularly lower end).	Reject	Section 12
933	S294.001	Jane Mitchell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Completely abandon the whole process and start again with public consultation [and specifically do not allow] developers to build 6-story high-rise developments through our existing family neighbourhoods, especially without resource consent.	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. 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. High-rise developments tend to exacerbate traffic congestion and parking problems. I understand the current proposed plan does not include mandatory vehicle access to each site. While many residents in the proposed high density areas will (hopefully) be limiting the use of their cars (by cycling and walking or taking public transport) the nature of our city means for most people at least one car is still required. Our public transport system is not sufficient to cover everyone's transport needs. With limited (if any) parking spaces and parking time restrictions these new developments and the surrounding streets will become congested, causing inconvenience for both existing residents and newcomers. The added traffic could also cause safety issues for pedestrians, cyclists and children. Six story apartments looming over single story family homes would cast shadows over these properties, block natural light and be a significant invasion of privacy. If a six storey building was built in front of our property we will loose the majority of our natural daylight which in turn will affect our abillity to passively heat our home, grow vegetables in our garden and generally threaten the	Reject	Section 9
934	S295.001	Ruth Watson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Cancel Plan Change 29.	It is unfair to introduce 3 - 6 storey buildings into established residential areas because it will deprive adjacent home owners of light, solar power, privacy, quality of life and reduce their house values. If dwellings are built with out car park facilities, cars will be parked on the road, clogging up the city even more than now. Private vehicles are a necessity in this region as public transport only allows travel with in the environs of the city.	Reject	Section 9
935	S296.001	Elspeth Martin	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the Plan Change 29 [except] buildings over 4 storeys need to have resource consent.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
936	S297.001	John Martin	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support Plan Change 29. However, I would prefer that buildings over 4 storeys should need a resource consent.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13

937	S298.001	Anna Playford	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Decline Plan Change 29.	The main reasons for the suggested changes are summarised as follows: 1. Maintaining the heritage look and feel of Nelson's suburbs, buildings and communities of historic value that would be irreversibly harmed by the piecemeal application of plan 29. 2. Quality of life of existing Nelson residents - particularly in relation to the sunshine hours, but also mental health aspects such as increased nervousness and fear of what their neighbours might do to take away their quality and most especially when properties change hands and the property may be bought by developers who have no regard for the community and life quality in surrounding properties 3. The proposal currently places Medium density (3 story) buildings in parts of Nelson that have been deemed to be subject to slips and/or other instabilities. It does seem shortsighted not to have overlaid the maps of know issues of this type with the current proposal and I would strongly recommend that this is done more thoroughly for future iterations of the plan 4, Finally I would suggest that resources are put towards a better understanding of the demand for additional housing, of what price range and type and that the plan is better made with incentives/mandates to create housing that will meet this demand rather than just allowing a piecemeal approach that hopes for individual developers to do the right thing by both existing communities and future residents and home owners - that it be more targeted and specific in order to create change that we would all like to live with [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
938	FS65.057	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Decline Plan Change 29. Reasons include (please also refer to our original submission #831 as in many cases multiple reasons have been noted): Submitter refers to destruction of heritage value. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources.	Accept in part	Section 12
939	FS78.078	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Decline Plan Change 29. Submitter refers to destruction of heritage value. 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.	Accept in part	Section 13
940	S298.005	Anna Playford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	If housing stock does need to be increased, limit intensification to Nelson's inner city centre and inner city fringe, and put incentives/mandates in place to create housing stock that will meet the current and future unmet need.	1. The quality of many commercial properties in central Nelson is low. Construction activity should be focussed on 4,5,6 storey, earthquake resilient, mixed use buildings which see residential above commercial/retail on lower floors. 2. Existing vacant central city sites should be designated for this mixed use development only, ie be required to provide residential as well as retail/commercial in all new builds in these parts of town. 3. A plan change could be created that creates an obligation to redevelop central city substandard buildings into these mixed use buildings with a marked increase in central city apartments would mean less use for private transport for a number of people coming into town for work, good for climate change also and there are many cities that can be looked to for examples of vibrant retail and hospitality in the city centre because of the need to service the significant portion of the population who live there. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
941	S301.001	Lyndon Chandler	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject the plan in its entirety.	Refer to reasons in submission point S301.002.	Reject	Section 9

942	S301.002	Lyndon Chandler	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Do not permit 3,4,5,6 storey buildings 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. Increased intensification will result in more on-street car parking and the narrow streets of Nelson will become a hazard to pedestrians, mobility scooters, cyclists, refuse collection and Emergency Service vehicles. This will cause fracturing of neighbourly relations and communities.	Reject	Section 9
943	S302.001	Gina Yukich	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support proposed plan change 29.	I believe the council should implement the proposed changes to encourage further densification of Nelsons urban areas over the next 30 years. I think it is important that natural hazards have been considered and built into the plan change as well. Higher density housing is critical for accessibility, affordability and mitigating our overall impact on climate change. The proposed plan changes will not result in immediate redevelopment of the town centres but will allow space for growing density in the next 30 years.	Accept	Section 9
944	S303.001	Iain Menzies	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the council's plan change 29 for infill housing.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
945	S304.001	Cameo Capital	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the proposed decision for intensification of residential and commercial areas.	Intensification of nelson needs to occur in strategic locations for the benefit of housing and private development to encourage positive progression of the area.	Reject	Section 10
946	S305.001	Peter Hay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Restrict any high density living (ie dwellings three stories or higher) to the Mixed Use and Central City zones already set out in the draft Whakamahere Whakatu Nelson Plan and leave the areas currently currently marked "high density" under PC29 as they are.	The erection of high rise buildings in the current residential zone will have a canyoning effect in the immediate vicinity of these structures. This will seriously compromise existing occupants' quality of life, their sense of neighbourhood and ability to lead environmentally appropriate lifestyles,- gardening and incorporation of solar technology. Residential rates will be adversely affected by the need for radical upgrading of currently old and marginally adequate drainage and sewage infrastructure and there will be challenges around traffic congestion and extra parking needs. Theoretical population projections for the city should not drive an ad hoc indiscriminate over-response involving massive construction projects. I believe the town plan for the next 20-30 years should not enable the squandering of urban aesthetics and flexibility, and rather it should delineate a precautionary, measured approach in the inner city. The Kainga Ora residential project planned for 107 Nile street provides a good model for allowable intensification in the inner residential area, with high rise development restricted to the CBD and the Mixed Use zones.	Accept in part	Section 12
947	S306.002	Chris Phillips	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Consider] certain areas of Nelson for buildings up to 4 to 6 stories high. [Refer to the original submission for mapped locations].	I would like to see council approach the revised plan from a different angle. The current proposal allows for random subdivision in most areas of Nelson which will lead to multiple properties losing sunlight. We need to look at creating communities with green spaces around them. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 13
948	S308.005	Michael Potter	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support intensification instead of greenfield development, specifically within Nelson South and Stoke village [inferred].	Intensification is desperately needed to protect arable land in Tasman and the surrounds of Nelson. Nelson South provides good access to the hospital and medium density housing would allow our aging population to have better affordable housing closer to medical needs. Stoke village is already used by a growing number of people with physical disabilities and health conditions. As the population grows and ages there will be greater demand for better access and affordable housing within walking distance of the village.	Reject	Section 10
949	S308.006	Michael Potter	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Create a plan for accesibility with prioritised engagement with disabled people groups to support Plan Change 29.	We can not see any evidence of engagement with disabled people groups in our reading of Plan Change 29 and ask that this be prioritised and a plan for accessibility similar to Tauranga be developed to support Plan Change 29.	Reject	Section 10

950	S309.001	Andrew Divett	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Ensure that Urban Design principles are used at the beginning of any new development.	I support the plan change because I believe that Nelson must increase housing density instead of using up land at the edges of the city. I do not support the placement of six storey buildings in existing small residential plots of land. Good urban design is a process that must be used early in planning any changes and this is well described in The Ministry for the Environment Urban Protocol to which Nelson Council is a signatory. Good Urban Design is a complex process and cannot be achieved by simply defining boundary setbacks and daylight angles. Nelson is, like most, cities, a complex organism and the principles require consideration across the whole of any design process. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 13
951	S310.001	James Purves	Entire Plan Change	Support	[Support Plan Change 29].	Change is often unpopular and good leadership will not please everyone. I encourage the Mayor and councillors to be strong & bold and push change through.	Accept in part	Section 13
952	S310.002	James Purves	Entire Plan Change	Support	Go further to encourage/incentivise development in the city, including by waiving development charges for inner city & city fringe residential development, [discouraging land banking] and [reducing restrictions for heritage buildings].	This can be achieved by exploring all options including but not limited to: 1. Waiving development charges for inner city & city fringe residential development. 2. Quadruple commercial rates, then offer a 75% reduction for tenanted property. We need to make it uneconomic for people to landbank. At worst this will increase the rate take, at best it will force the rental market down (to qualify for rates rebate), or make people want to redevelop or sell to developers. 3. Lobby at a local & national level that (particularly where earthquake strengthening is required but not commercially feasible) that heritage protections will be waived IF old decrepit buildings are replaced within a fixed time frame with residential development. It seems crazy to protect heritage when we have too little housing which contributes to high house prices and homelessness. Let's get our priorities straight.	Accept in part	Section 12
953	S310.003	James Purves	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Reclassify some zones that have been zoned high density residential [and allow medium density residential instead].	I think some of the residential areas selected that would be allowed six storey development are not yet appropriate for it, allowing up to 3 storeys and increasing density would already go a long way to encouraging development in those zones.	Accept in part	Section 12
954	S312.001	Diane Rose	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	I reject PC29 in its entirety. Refer to reasons in submission points S312.002 - S312.008.	Reject	Section 9
955	FS5.020	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 9
956	S312.002	Diane Rose	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.	We oppose the proposed HDZ in residential areas where there is no walkable access to amenities (supermarkets, schools and public transport).	Accept in Part	Section 12
957	FS61.079	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- If HDZ are approved for some areas, we particularly oppose the proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills area. We ask the Council to remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ because of ongoing slope instability in this area, lack of infrastructure, lack of the essential amenities (no supermarkets or public transport) within walking distance, and the increased likelihood of slips directly caused by intensification development and frequent weather events. [Refer to the following sections of the original submission for more detail: 1. Slope Instability, 2. Amenities, 3. Traffic, 4. Sunlight and Shading Effects, 5. Trees and Gardens in the Tahunanui Hills HDZ, 6. Recreation, and 7. Intensification]. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Because of comprehensive community/local knowledge as stated 1-7 reinforces need for a community led council plan.	Accept in part	Section 12

958	FS72.083	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- If HDZ are approved for some areas, we particularly oppose the proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills area. We ask the Council to remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ because of ongoing slope instability in this area, lack of infrastructure, lack of the essential amenities (no supermarkets or public transport) within walking distance, and the increased likelihood of slips directly caused by intensification development and frequent weather events. [Refer to the following sections of the original submission for more detail: 1. Slope Instability, 2. Amenities, 3. Traffic, 4. Sunlight and Shading Effects, 5. Trees and Gardens in the Tahunanui Hills HDZ, 6. Recreation, and 7. Intensification]. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Because of comprehensive community/local knowledge as stated 1-7 reinforces need for a community led council plan.	Accept in part	Section 12
959	FS60.075	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- If HDZ are approved for some areas, we particularly oppose the proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills area. We ask the Council to remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ because of ongoing slope instability in this area, lack of infrastructure, lack of the essential amenities (no supermarkets or public transport) within walking distance, and the increased likelihood of slips directly caused by intensification development and frequent weather events. [Refer to the following sections of the original submission for more detail: 1. Slope Instability, 2. Amenities, 3. Traffic, 4. Sunlight and Shading Effects, 5. Trees and Gardens in the Tahunanui Hills HDZ, 6. Recreation, and 7. Intensification]. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Because of comprehensive community/local knowledge as stated 1-7 reinforces need for a community led council plan.	Accept in part	Section 12
960	S312.005	Diane Rose	Mapping	Oppose	Remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ.	If HDZ are approved for some areas, we particularly oppose the proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills area. We ask the Council to remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ because of ongoing slope instability in this area, lack of infrastructure, lack of the essential amenities (no supermarkets or public transport) within walking distance, and the increased likelihood of slips directly caused by intensification development and frequent weather events. [Refer to the following sections of the original submission for more detail: 1. Slope Instability, 2. Amenities, 3. Traffic, 4. Sunlight and Shading Effects, 5. Trees and Gardens in the Tahunanui Hills HDZ, 6. Recreation, and 7. Intensification].	Accept in part	Section 12
961	S312.009	Diane Rose	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw PC29 and have planning staff refine the plan design and follow the proper procedure of consultation and public engagement.	In our opinion, the PC29 process needs to be paused and re-evaluated before progressing to the hearing stage.	Reject	Section 13
962	S312.010	Diane Rose	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Inform all rate payers individually with emails and letters about any changes to their property zoning and to give each ratepayer the opportunity to respond.	We have found the lack of early public engagement and consultation on Plan Change 29 extremely stressful. We only found out about the plan change by chance through a family member. There was no letter or email from the Nelson City Council. When we questioned this we were told we should have read the Nelson Evening Mail and we should have been looking on the Nelson City Council website. We have still received nothing by email or letter from the Council about the proposed change plan to our property.	Reject	Section 13
963	S312.011	Diane Rose	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint independent hearing commissioners for the plan change.	We question why the hearing panel is not made up of independent hearing commissioners as it is a council led plan change.	Reject	Section 13

964	S312.012	Diane Rose	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC for population growth which have informed the intensification requirements are not Statistics NZ medium projections.	Reject	Section 10
965	S313.003	Sloane Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Restrict any medium density living (ie dwellings 3 stories or higher) to the Mixed Use and Centre City zones already set out in the draft Whakamahere Whakatū Nelson Plan and leave the areas currently marked "medium density" under PC 29 as they currently are.	For the same reasons I stated in the High Density Residential section. There appears to be ample support and provision for medium high density houses already and therefore it does not need the Plan Change to allow for this type of development.	Reject	Section 12
966	S314.007	Gardner/Mitchell Group	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Create an independent regional urban development agency to provide guidance to the council and oversee a designer led development plan across Nelson. [The devlelopment plan] should include community needs such as schools, green spaces with trees, community gardens, landscaping and street character, medical centres and community meeting areas.	Refer to reasons in submission point S314.001.	Accept in part	Section 13
967	S314.008	Gardner/Mitchell Group	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Waive the resource consent fees for changing a 1-2 storey property to include up to 2 extra units on the same piece of land where infrastructure capacity is available.	There should be no resource consent or fee to change 1-2 storey properties to include up to 2 extra units on same piece of land if water and drainage infrastructure has the capacity to cope. This allows for more inhabitants being self contained on the same section with cheaper living costs and provision for cheaper rentals.	Reject	Section 9
968	S315.001	Fiona White	Entire Plan Change	Support	[Support] Plan [Change] 29 with a provision for some overall design oversight to encourage and modify developer's plans with the aim to create more harmonious and attractive buildings with green spaces.	The reasons I support the plan change are:- The need to provide more housing. Fertile farmland should be preserved as far as possible and urban sprawl avoided. The inner city needs more people to revitalise the centre. More people would be able to live near work and leisure and be able to walk and bike. More diversity in the choice of housing. Improvement in the quality of housing stock to modern standards. There would be an increase in the number of people to pay rates thereby enabling council to provide amenities and infrastructure. An article in stuff on 23rd Oct. talked about an overall plan and a feasability study on forming a Nelson Tasman Urban development agency. I think this may be the way to get the oversight I would like.	Reject	Section 13
969	S316.002	Kim Odendaal	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Increase height] in neighborhoods not yet established, or city centre.	Look to add height in neighborhoods not yet established, or city center where it is the norm.	Accept in part	Section 12
970	S317.004	Rosa Coutts	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 S317.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
971	S317.006	Rosa Coutts	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S317.001 and S317.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
972	S317.007	Rosa Coutts	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
973	S317.008	Rosa Coutts	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
974	S317.010	Rosa Coutts	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Research on successful international examples for increasing housing].	I'm sure there are many international successful ideas for increasing housing, and also many unsuccessful ideas. Some research on this would be really good.	Reject	Section 13

975	S318.004	James Greeks	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 S318.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
976	S318.006	James Greeks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S371.001 and S371.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
977	S318.007	James Greeks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
978	S318.008	James Greeks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
979	S319.004	Pauline Jones	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 319.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
980	S319.006	Pauline Jones	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S319.001 and S319.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
981	S319.007	Pauline Jones	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
982	S319.008	Pauline Jones	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
983	S322.003	Cathy Nicholson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Carry out a review of the process by which the 25 year population projections have been developed and publish findings.	In comparing other cities in New Zealand, that have populations between 43,000 and 70,000 Nelson is below the median in population density and the number of people on the Housing records. With such a radical suggested change in the need for additional housing perhaps the need has been overstated.	Reject	Section 10
984	S322.004	Cathy Nicholson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request that there is a Design Standards Commission].	Suggesting a broad brush approach to planning for needed intensification of housing without having clear guidelines for design is not good practice. In the absence of this our community, our current home owners, could be left with structures which are not good quality. The plan does not include a Design Standards Commission.	Reject	Section 13
985	S322.006	Cathy Nicholson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Include in the plan a process that would look at individual neighbourhoods to determine what is appropriate for that neighbourhood.	Currently PC 29 has lumped current residences into three buckets - General, Medium and High Density - and has not considered the needs for those neighbourhoods. Nelson is known for its many unique neighbourhoods, each with its own character, and yet those neighbourhoods have been assigned one of the three designations. This is another example of the Broad Brush approach of this proposed plan that will destroy the uniqueness of our various communities.	Reject	Section 12
986	S322.008	Cathy Nicholson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request that] notice to be provided, and opportunity to comment, to neighbouring homes of all changes in previously approved plans for residential housing.	Under PC29, as currently written, developers can increase the number of residential units, in a previously approved plan, without notice to neighbouring homes. Neighbours should have the right to make comments on such changes that could have a significant impact on them.	Reject	Section 12
987	S322.011	Cathy Nicholson	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Change the proposed plan to include a phased-in approach for intensification - starting with areas that will have the least impact on current residential areas.	This would avoid a gun shot approach to the changes to our community and could be thoughtfully planned and expanded as needed. It is a frightening thought that over the next 30 years having an approved plan that would likely change the landscape of our entire beautiful city. Just Imagining a series 4 to 6 story apartment complexes dotted around the neighbourhoods is unbearable.	Reject	Section 10
988	S322.012	Cathy Nicholson	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Include provisions for existing homeowners that will consider their rights for radical changes that will affect the value and enjoyment of their homes.	All of the emphasis for the PC 29 is about the needs of future people moving to our community. Currently there is nothing in the proposed changes that considers the impact on existing homeowners. A plan that addresses the needs of all concerned is the right thing to do.	Reject	Section 9

989	S322.013	Cathy Nicholson	Entire Plan Change	Amend	[Request] Plan Change 29 should include a Plan rather than using a Broad Brush approach to provide intensification in our community.	Nearly every part of our professional and personal lives suggest that it is good practice to plan in advance. Our current Future Development Plan spells out the need for neighbourhood plans, yet PC 29 does not take that into account. We know that when people who are likely to be affected by change are involved in the process, not only are happier but they very often provide valuable input along the way. Yet all of the planning of this Broad Brush non-plan has been done without adequate input from those it will serve. It is a proven fact that well-designed towns and cities do not happen by chance - they are thoughtful planned.	Reject	Section 12
990	S322.014	Cathy Nicholson	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	[Support] intensification of the Nelson Tasman region.	Intensification of the Nelson Tasman region is needed and it is important. Yes, we need intensification, but PC 29 lacks a process that has been inclusive of the people it affects, and has been poorly drafted.	Accept in part	Section 12
991	S324.001	Zero Carbon Nelson Tasman	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support intensification and building more densely in certain areas, not out, but ideally first calculate the carrying capacity of the city and region. Support the strategy of 15-minute communities, and the intensification focused around transport hubs will assist with this process.	Before assuming that the city can function with thousands of extra people, we would ideally first calculate the carrying capacity of the city and region. However, acknowledging this information gap, and the framework within which the Council is required to work.	Accept in part	Section 11
992	S325.004	Ken Clapcott	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Delete the] High Density Residential Zone (HDZ) in Stoke only, that has a max height greater than 12m.	I oppose the creation of a High Density Residential Zone (HDZ) in Stoke only, that has a max height greater than 12 m as it is not mandated under NPS-UD 2020. Refer to reasons in submission point S325.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
993	S325.006	Ken Clapcott	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S325.001 and S325.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
994	S325.007	Ken Clapcott	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
995	S325.008	Ken Clapcott	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages,	Reject	Section 13
996	S325.009	Ken Clapcott	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Support medium and high residential zoning in Nelson and medium residential zoning in Stoke. However, [amend the] rules, especially in relation to sunlight angles and parking. Christchurch's medium density rules seem more appropriate.	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.	Accept in part	Section 12
997	S327.001	Gillian Starling	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] the council to make the process of feedback about the Plan Change to be more accessible for people.	1. The submission process is complicated. This means that only a small number of people will return a form compared to the numbers of people who feel strongly about the Plan Change. 2. The process of filling in documentation is alienating to a lot of people. 3. For feedback and consultation to be really meaningful the process needs to be equitable and accessible. Other formats should be available. It would be interesting to have an actual 3D model of the town and the neighbourhoods for people to use for suggestions. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
998	FS83.049	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12

999	S327.002	Gillian Starling	Residential Zones	Oppose	Retain the [operative] zoning for Mount St. [Ensure that] no decision on changing the zoning is made without experts assessing the Mount St area and making recommendations based on the hill's geography and challenges.	1. Mount St is on a steep hill that is prone to erosion. The land is not suitable for the building of multiple units on a single section. This will cause significant issues for the properties on the lower sections of the hill. There have been slips due to flood events and the water run off down the hill during normal rainy days is significant. 2. The road along Mount St and Konini St is already a challenge to drive on and to walk on. Many sections are so narrow that only one car can pass through at a time. This issue shows that increasing the number of people living on the street will have significant problems for current and future residents. 3. Mount St is a special place to live because of the amount of green space around the houses. Many gardens have been established over the last hundred years. The number of large native trees support many species of native birds which is a real positive for the city. I believe it is vital to retain these areas of green space that are close to the city, both for our wildlife, for the environment and for the positive mental health of the residents. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12
1000	FS83.050	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1001	S327.004	Gillian Starling	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose all High Density Zones in Nelson's surburban neighbourhoods.	The 'broad brush' approach to Plan Change 29 has not considered the impact on the lives of current residents in the neighbourhoods where high density zones are recommended. It is not reasonable to expect people to give up their privacy and sunlight due to an apartment being built on the section next door. It is unreasonable for the council to give the mandate for redevelopment entirely to commercial developers. This can result in poorly designed properties that do not fit into older neighbourhoods. There needs to be more stringent regulations for developers to adhere to. The reduction in green areas around properties is very negative from an environmental perspective and with regard to people's health. I feel that the ability for developers to build 3 units on a section without needing consent is a backward step.	Reject	Section 9
1002	FS83.052	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1003	S327.006	Gillian Starling	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Revisit the statistics that have been used to justify the level of intensification planned for. Use the Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts instead.	The level of growth that High Density Zones allow for, is often not feasible in the earmarked neighbourhoods. Infrastructure is often inadequate, particularly with regard to water, sewage and roading. I don't believe that the estimation of how fast our population will grow is accurate. Therefore the rationale behind the necessity of building high density housing in the suburbs is questionable.	Reject	Section 10
1004	FS83.054	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1005	S328.003	Hanni Kaspar	Residential Zones	Amend	Promote townhouse perimeter developments over infill building in the High and Medium Density Residential zones.	Perimeter developments allow for more sunlight admission into the buildings. Amalgamating the yards into a largish piece of land gives the residents a sense of space (instead of staring at a wall 4m away) and the children a place to play right next to where they live.	Reject	Section 12
1006	S328.004	Hanni Kaspar	Residential Zones	Amend	Provide children's playgrounds in densely populated residential zones, within easy walking distance to the places children are living, in the High, Medium and General Residential zones.	The plan changes "Housing" aim to intensify housing in large measure by infill building, turning gardens into additional living spaces. Where are the children to get rid of all their energy? Recreational open spaces are often too far away for a quick walk to the playground for 40 minutes of jumping, running and playing with other kids.	Accept in part	Section 9
1007	S328.006	Hanni Kaspar	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Concerning residential intensification zones currently containing mostly single storey houses: release city blocks for intensification instead of large zones.	I am concerned that there will be a 3 or 6 storey building here and there sticking out of a sea of single storey houses, making Nelson look disjointed. Better to consistently intensify a smaller area before moving on to the next block. Also, many home owners fear loosing sun and privacy to a considerably higher building as neighbour. Opening smaller areas for intensification reduces the number of people suffering anxieties over intensification which might never happen on a site adjacent to theirs.	Reject	Section 12

1008	S328.009	Hanni Kaspar	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Instead of pushing for intensification [consider] a push for urban renewal and a more holistic approach.	As mentioned above, greenfield - or rather greenhill - development is taking place on the outskirts of Nelson, close enough for active transport into the city centre. The houses being built are all good sized free standing single units. Wouldn't it make sense to set aside at least part (if not all) of the newly opened up land for comprehensive higher density housing? If the placing and design parameters of the denser housing are clearly shown early in the development, people wanting to build stand-alone one-off homes can plan and design to avoid negative environmental impact from the denser housing. [Refer to the attachment in the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
1009	S329.001	Inea Yoon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	I agree with intensification but not as stated in PC29 for the reasons below. Social Impact will be disastrous if PC29 in its current form to go through with no real discussion or vision with affected neighbourhoods. William Samual (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HJxk1AE_LTs at 56mins) had an interesting take on 'designing' the City, and not leaving it up to developers, which is what PC29 will do. This was very informative and I agree with William.	Reject	Section 9
1010	S329.002	Inea Yoon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1011	S329.003	Inea Yoon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th [2023] vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1012	S329.004	Inea Yoon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1013	S329.006	Inea Yoon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S329.005.	Reject	Section 13
1014	S329.010	Inea Yoon	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1015	S329.011	Inea Yoon	Mapping	Oppose	Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district, 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.	Refer to reasons in submission point S329.010.	Reject	Section 12

1016	FS28.113	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district, 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 in part	Section 12
1017	S329.013	Inea Yoon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
1018	S329.018	Inea Yoon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S329.005 and S329.010.	Reject	Section 13
1019	S329.019	Inea Yoon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1020	S329.028	Inea Yoon	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 S329.027.	Reject	Section 9
1021	S329.029	Inea Yoon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1022	S329.030	Inea Yoon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1023	S329.036	Inea Yoon	Heritage	Oppose	[Commission] an 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).	Nelson has a high proportion of heritage and character buildings, clusters of which merit further investigation for precinct listing and specific rules and policies e.g. height controls on adjacent buildings.	Reject	Section 12

1024	FS65.112	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: [Commission] an 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). 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 in part	Section 12
1025	FS78.531	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: [Commission] an 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).	Reject	Section 12
1026	S330.001	Jennifer Pomeroy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Redraft plan 29 so that high intensity is confined to the CBD. (CBD boundary to remain unchanged).	Population might be predicted to grow but the proposed plan 29 changes are suggesting at the rate of Shanghai rather than Nelson! Overkill. We do need some intensification but this is overkill, unsophisticated and doesn't take any of Nelson's natural strengths into consideration. Limit high density multi story to the existing CBD and if in future proves to be inadequate then consider expanding the zone. but fill up the middle first! As it stands tower blocks could spring up randomly. Although new dwellings don't need carparks - get real - I can't see anything in your plan that will address the extra cars associated with extra dwellings. I also can't see with random development how planning for extra schools, doctors surgeries etc will be in appropriate places. are the sewers, drainage, electricity supply etc up to scratch in every single location in the high and medium density zones to cope with random intensification. Quite often I hear comments like "don't worry it won't happen it will be too expensive" - if it is truly too expensive then the plan doesn't address the crisis. [Refer to the original submission for further details.]	Reject	Section 9
1027	S330.003	Jennifer Pomeroy	Mapping	Oppose in part	Redraft plan 29 so that some of the proposed High Density can become Medium Density, but no more than two stories when affecting daylight of neighbouring properties and certainly not a blanket over the whole area.	Refer to the reasons in S330.001.	Reject	Section 12
1028	S331.001	James Taylor	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject] Plan Change 29.	1. The plan did not have the required community consultation at the beginning. The decision to make Nelson a Tier One city is not appropriate. The hundreds of pages that people have to try and digest is not reasonable. 2. The statistics used to justify the level of intensification proposed have been wildly misinterpreted.	Reject	Section 13
1029	FS33.003	Stephen Fitchett		Support	Accept	Lack of consultation given the range and complexities of the changes. I attended the Trafalgar Centre meeting but the soundproofing requirements for alterations to houses within 100 metres of State Highway 6 have received little (no??) publicity. Given the highway runs right through Nelson this clause will affect a great number of residents.	Reject	Section 13

1030	S331.002	James Taylor	Mapping	Oppose	[Reject] the Medium Density Residential zone in the Mount St area.	1. The Mount St neighbourhood cannot take an increase in volume of people because the road is narrow and passing ways are already difficult. In places there is no pavement to walk along and people often are walking in the road because cars are parking across the pavements that do exist. 2. The geology of the hill is not suitable for greater development. 3. Any intensification is likely to destroy the character and feel of this long established neighbourhood. 4. The possibility of Medium Density Residential Zone development will cause people enormous anxiety because of the threat of building next to their homes. 5. Mount St does not have any available space for more parked cars.	Accept in part	Section 12
1031	S331.004	James Taylor	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	If necessary, start with intensification in the CBD.	1. There are plenty of large sites that could be used for intensification. Some land is sitting empty, some land has buildings on it that are no longer in use, some land use seems inappropriate in the city. 2. The City Fringe is under-used. Many of the commercial operators along Vanguard St and St Vincent could be re-located and the land used for intensification. This is an area that is flat so good for building, it is close to the city and there are not established neighbourhoods that will affected by building apartments. Many of the properties situated there are run down and old.	Reject	Section 10
1032	S331.005	James Taylor	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Bring in a group of architects to come up with a plan for the whole city so that it is cohesive and imaginative.	Refer to the reasons in S331.001 - S331.004.	Reject	Section 13
1033	S334.001	Fiona Hosie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdrawal of the plan change by Council prior to calling for further submissions, and if not withdrawn, rejection (dismissal/cancellation) of the whole Plan Change 29 by the Commissioner and/or the Council.	The whole basis for the plan change (i.e. the expected increase in population) is false and Council did not rely sufficiently on Statistics NZ figures. There have been no neighbourhood meetings or consultation as recommended in the Future Development Strategy. I acknowledge that I have found it difficult (in fact impossible) to digest the total effect of the proposed PC29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages. I consider that some of the publicity coming out of Council (in relation to the plan change) has been positively misleading. I hope that more qualified citizens will make more comprehensive submissions covering my concerns as to the ongoing protection of existing views and access to sunlight for all residential occupiers, and absence of any encouragement to provide parking.	Reject	Section 10
1034	S334.012	Fiona Hosie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Redraft the objectives and policies of the plan change to appropriately reflect all the [previous requests].	Not stated.	Reject	Section 9
1035	S334.013	Fiona Hosie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent panel (i.e. no present Councillors) to hear submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
1036	S335.001	Deborah Coulter	Residential Zones	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29, especially in relation to the introduction of High Density Residential Zone at Stoke.	This change will significantly negatively impact the lives of residents already living in infill housing - for example my property has no street frontage and is already quite close to neighbours. With Plan Change 29 my property would be likely to end up with virtually no sun at all. This sort of situation will affect the health (mental and physical of people living in these areas). For higher density housing there needs to be consultation with those in housing nearby - it should not simply be a permitted activity. Higher density housing should be properly planned with green space around it - and consultation with neighbours. Adequate green space around would stop high rise housing severely negatively affecting existing infill housing.	Accept in part	Section 12

1037	S336.001	Zachary Domike	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Prior to selection of specific areas affected by this Plan Change, wait for the imminent resolution of the Nelson Tenths lawsuit.	Plan Change 29 is based on the existing map of property ownership, but this is not stable. The Court has clearly stated that about one billion dollars worth of NCC property will be reassigned as listed in the NZHerald article [referred to in the submission]. Changes of this magnitude will reform an unpredictable extent of Nelson City; a postponement of the Plan Change 29 will prevent substantial planning dislocations in the New Year.	Reject	Section 10
1038	S337.001	Nanette Barberel	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Reject Plan Change 29].	Plan Change 29 offers no respect to existing rights to share sunshine and views and protect people's privacy as we do now. Intensification upwards is not the answer. That being said I see an opportunity to revitalise the CBD with sympathetic development of apartments for those wanting inner city living. Nelson's development will be dictated by developers and bureaucrats with residents having no input to changes impacting the social fabric of Nelson - not so democratic! No parking provisions: will result in parking in streets adding to congestion, safety matters. People are not going to suddenly divest themselves of their cars. Accessibility: Assumes that Nelson has a relevant, effective public transport system. Residents through disability or age (not exhaustive) will be marginalised living in high density areas (15mins from amenities). What is to happens after thirty years and this grand plan has forever changed the Nelson landscape and people are living hemmed into residences without sun and at war with neighbours/developers developing property that impinge on others spaces? Nelson will have lost its charms and attractions that have led and kept us here by choice. What will Nelson's next steps be when there is no longer any land left to develop? Do we then consider underground options? How many properties are currently sitting vacant or used only as holiday accommodation only? Intensification in Nelson is not going to resolve the countries population growth issues and our environment should not be compromised by policies made centrally(eg parking requirements). Perhaps expansion should be catered for by development of satellite towns rather than intensification.	Accept in part	Section 12
1039	S338.001	Tim Morrison	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC 29 in its entirety.	Refer to the reasons in submission points S338.002 - S338.010.	Reject	Section 9
1040	S338.003	Tim Morrison	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	I strongly oppose the High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
1042	S338.008	Tim Morrison	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Negotiate and/or incentivise Industry and commercial premises [in the city centre and fringe] to relocate, to less essential land.	Refer to reasons in submission point S338.007.	Reject	Section 10
1043	S338.009	Tim Morrison	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth in a manner that does not: •Block resident's views. •Shade properties. •Invade resident's privacy. •Reduce resident's amenity. •Substantially reduce adjacent property values when they are impacted by a development.	These are significant adverse effects, and an adjacent property owner will lose amenity and sustain large loss of property value without compensation. This is unfair and should not be endorsed by Council. I accept that some intensification is necessary, but I believe that intensification can be achieved without the gross effects that PC 29 will bring.	Reject	Section 13

1044	S338.010	Tim Morrison	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Create a broader level of protection for neighbourhoods beyond the heritage buildings and precincts that still have historic character value from the early settlement years of Nelson.	I acknowledge that Council is responding to Government directions to intensify housing and understand the intent behind that Government direction. Nelson is a very special and unique place that needs to be protected with care. It is unlike any other district in NZ. It includes a 'Low Rise' City with a collection of heritage and non-heritage character buildings that have attracted people for generations and been a cherished holiday destination for many New Zealanders. Residential neighbourhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy and new developments thoughtfully designed and planned on a neighbourhood, by neighbourhood basis to maintain the essence of their character. Green Spaces, Trees and Landscaping are essential for the look and feel of some of our older neighbourhoods. They help considerably with the wellbeing of the residents and help to provide an essential part of the attraction of Nelson, which must all be considered during developing the growth of Nelson. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
1045	S339.002	Mark Alderson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Update all the data to ensure the correct information is being used in any plan changes. [including] the council to visit and make sure all the information used in Plan Change 29 is correct and up to date.	I am concerned about the current distribution of high-density housing and its composition in terms of ownership. Understanding the proportion of owner-occupied, rental, and short-term rental properties (such as Air B&B) within high-density housing areas is important for gauging the community's residential stability and sense of place. An example would be the city's current high-density housing. Creating holiday homes or short-term residential second homes does not benefit the economy or the residents. It is not a reason to destroy communities. I fully support all additional housing, be it social or otherwise that enhances and supports the community. Refer also to the reasons in submission point S339.001.	Reject	Section 12
1046	FS78.460	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
1047	S339.004	Mark Alderson	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Request] a more in-depth explanation for this course of action. [Including an explanation as to] why did the council take the mandatory tier option when Nelson/Tasman is not required under the government proposal? [sic]	The Draft Plan Change 29 if enacted has wide-ranging and significant effects on the character and identity of Nelson. The current consultation process for Proposed Plan Change 29 has been insufficient in providing all affected residents with the opportunity to engage in meaningful dialogue with planners and Elected Members. The initial submission period was not long enough to allow people to make considered responses to the documentation. Going forward with this process, I implore the Nelson City Council to prioritize transparent communication and accessible avenues for public input to ensure that the voices of our diverse community are heard and considered before the Draft plan Change process goes any further. (Facebook should not be the only media used). Residents deserve the right to access these decisions. Include in this explanation, how qualified the council and its members are to decide on such complex processes. One paid expert to complete any report is insufficient and undemocratic	Reject	Section 9
1048	FS78.463	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

1049	S339.006	Mark Alderson	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Request] economic analysis to address the effects of proposals on the wider economy of Nelson.	The Analysis does not address the effect this Draft Plan Change 29 would have on Nelson's broader economy. It may be that this level of intensification in residential areas will make the city much less attractive to visitors, investors, potential employers, and employees and will adversely affect the amount of projected housing demand. Certainly, in the area of tourism, the proposed High Density in residential areas will have a negative impact on visitors to what has been a historic city, famed for its colourful streets and safe, welcoming neighborhoods.	Reject	Section 9
1050	FS78.465	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
1051	S339.007	Mark Alderson	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Request] a minimum of five members for [the plan change hearing panel] including three independent members from across New Zealand and the two remaining positions should be anonymously selected from the council.	I strongly do not support the council's current proposal to have only three members on the committee who will make final recommendations to the council. Also as a resident of this city, I do not fully endorse the current candidates selected for this committee. Request: a minimum of five members for this group. As there is no one member of this current council who is sufficiently qualified in this subject, the most professional course of action would be to choose three independent members from across New Zealand and the two remaining positions should be anonymously selected from the council. As to the Mayor's point, add a local touch.	Reject	Section 13
1052	FS78.466	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
1053	S339.008	Mark Alderson	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	Clarify whether these changes are designed to attract a specific socioeconomic group and how this aligns with the needs and aspirations of the broader community.	Proposed Social Demographic and Socioeconomic Impact: The introduction of high-density housing raises questions about the intended social demographic. It is important to clarify whether these changes are designed to attract a specific socioeconomic group and how this aligns with the needs and aspirations of the broader community. I am particularly concerned about the potential impact of introducing high-density housing on disposable-income households, as this could adversely affect local businesses, especially the hospitality industry.	Reject	Section 12
1054	FS78.467	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
1055	S339.009	Mark Alderson	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	Evaluate whether our transportation, utilities, and public services can adequately support the increased demands of a growing population.	Sufficiency of Infrastructure: Any proposed changes must be carefully assessed for their impact on our city's infrastructure. It is essential to evaluate whether our transportation, utilities, and public services can adequately support the increased demands of a growing population. Neglecting this aspect could undermine the quality of life for current and future residents.	Reject	Section 11
1056	FS81.001	Patricia Ann Morris		Support	Accept	As per my original submission S202 which states that the current infrastructure cannot cope with the existing population because of this I am against 6 storeys high developments. The current infrastructure cannot cope with the existing population, so to increase housing density will cause more problems. Money should be spent on maintaining what we have got, before new builds, especially 6 floors high.	Accept	Section 12

1057	FS82.001	Richard Terry Morris		Support	Accept	I disagree with the intensification of Nelson. There is not the infrastructure to properly support the existing population. The more intense a population is, the greater demand there is on infrastructure. Both National and International figures bear this out. Population Density was studied by Dr Calhoun, and others, may years ago and their unpleasant findings have been born out - again National and International figures will confirm this.	Reject	Section 9
1058	FS78.468	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
1059	S339.010	Mark Alderson	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	Address the capacity of our local schools and the impact of Proposed Plan Change 29 on schooling capacity.	Schooling Capacity: With potential population growth, it is crucial to address the capacity of our local schools. A thorough analysis of the impact of Proposed Plan Change 29 on schooling capacity is vital to ensure that our educational institutions can continue to provide a high standard of education and accommodate the needs of the community.	Reject	Section 11
1060	FS78.469	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
1061	S340.001	John Hugo	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose all parts of the current plan and [Request] the Nelson City Council thoroughly assess thepotential impacts of Plan Change 29 on the current residents and take proactivemeasures to address these concerns. Engaging in open dialogue with thecommunity, conducting comprehensive impact assessments, and implementingmitigation strategies to ensure a smooth transition andsustainable development.	I am writing to express my concerns and provide input on Plan Change 29 and its potential impacts on the current residents of our city. While I acknowledge the need for urban development and improvement of infrastructure, it is imperative that the well-being and livelihoods of the existing residents are given due consideration during this process. The proposed Plan Change 29 has the potential to bring about positive changes to our community. However, it is important to address the following aspects, associated costs, potential consequences, and additional financing considerations that may significantly impact the lives of current residents: [Refer to original submission on each of the matters below] Transport infrastructure Water and sewage infrastructure Utilities and Energy infrastructure Education and healthcare facilities Community and Recreational Spaces Off-street parking for cars, bicycles and mobility scooters Excessive height and area of development Developer's levy for financing Cost implications for current residents Development Agency.	Reject	Section 13
1062	S340.013	John Hugo	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Change the make up of the Hearing panel to a majority of independent members [inferred].	How can a panel to decide the final outcome of submissions be considered independent if the majority are already quoted in public as supporting Plan 29 as it currently stands.	Reject	Section 13
1063	S340.015	John Hugo	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Ensuring that the current water supply and sewage systems can adequately support the increased demand.	With the expansion of urban areas, there will be a greater demand for water and sewage services. Ensuring that the current water supply and sewage systems can adequately support the increased demand is vital. Upgrades and expansions maybe necessary to prevent water shortages, ensure water quality, and manage waste effectively. How much redevelopment of the current wastewater facility is required if the HDZ became fully developed as per current plan 29 in a 15 year period?	Accept in part	Section 11
1064	S340.016	John Hugo	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Carefully plan Infrastructure upgrades for utilities such as electricity, gas, and internet services to accommodate demand [while] preventing service disruptions and maintaining the quality of life for existing residents.	As the population grows, the demand for utilities such as electricity, gas, and internet services will rise. Infrastructure upgrades to accommodate this demand should be carefully planned to prevent service disruptions and maintain the quality of life for existing residents.	Reject	Section 11

1065	S340.017	John Hugo	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Invest in new facilities or expansions of education and healthcare facilities.	Education and Healthcare Facilities: As the city evolves, it is crucial to consider the availability and accessibility of education and healthcare facilities - is the new Hospital really going to address the proposed population growth? Additional residential developments may lead to increased pressure on existing schools and medical centres. Investments in new facilities or expansions may be required to cater to the growing population.	Reject	Section 10
1066	S340.018	John Hugo	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Preserve and enhance community spaces, parks, and recreational areas.	Community and Recreational Spaces: Preserving and enhancing community spaces, parks, and recreational areas is essential for the overall well-being of the residents. As the city expands, maintaining these spaces and creating new ones should be apriority to ensure that residents continue to have access to a high quality of life.	Reject	Section 12
1067	S340.022	John Hugo	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Consider implementing a developer's levy to help finance the required infrastructure enhancements and community facilities.	Developer's Levy for Financing: Given the extensive nature of proposed changes, it is reasonable to consider implementing a developer's levy to help finance the required infrastructure enhancements and community facilities. Such a levy can serve as a dedicated funding source to support the long-term sustainability and well-being of both current and future resident's needs (drinking water supplies, wastewater waste water removal/treatment, power supplies, roading upgrades for more buses).	Reject	Section 11
1068	S340.023	John Hugo	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Set up a development agency.	Development Agency: It is rather imperative that a development agency IS set up as dropping ugly developments all over our town in a piecemeal fashion will detract from the overall appearance and desirability of Nelson as a place to live. Not having a development agency is in my opinion a cowards cop out of the responsibility regarding the development of our city. Can we not simply start in the CBD as there will soon be a plethora of empty space as business continues to fly to out of CBD/town developments.	Accept in part	Section 13
1069	S340.024	John Hugo	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Start [development] in the CBD.	Refer to reasons in submission point S340.023.	Reject	Section 10
1070	S342.001	Christopher Cunningham	Mapping	Oppose in part	Remove the High Density zone from the hill around Tosswill Road and Tamaki Street, and zone the Tahuna hills no higher than Medium density.	- The current development of this area is low-density and relatively widely spaced. Building 6-story blocks in this area would be a dramatic and stark change of character. - The hill is steeply sloping, with Tamaki st having a gradient of around 20%. Tall buildings on the hillside will loom over those lower down the slope, and cast extremely long shadows across all the buildings lower down the hillside in the mornings. - Tosswill road is narrow, fairly steep, and winding. It is unsuitable for heavy / additional traffic. - The bottom of Tamaki street (along with the adjacent lower edge of the proposed zone) is a large steep bank, with steps for pedestrians. Adding vehicle access here would be very difficult.	Accept in part	Section 12
1071	FS61.066	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- - The current development of this area is low-density and relatively widely spaced. Building 6-story blocks in this area would be a dramatic and stark change of character. - The hill is steeply sloping, with Tamaki st having a gradient of around 20%. Tall buildings on the hillside will loom over those lower down the slope, and cast extremely long shadows across all the buildings lower down the hillside in the mornings. - Tosswill road is narrow, fairly steep, and winding. It is unsuitable for heavy / additional traffic. - The bottom of Tamaki street (along with the adjacent lower edge of the proposed zone) is a large steep bank, with steps for pedestrians. Adding vehicle access here would be very difficult. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Importance of community plans and engagement instead of broad brush approach from a distance.	Accept in part	Section 12

1072	FS72.070	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The current development of this area is low-density and relatively widely spaced. Building 6-story blocks in this area would be a dramatic and stark change of character. - The hill is steeply sloping, with Tamaki st having a gradient of around 20%. Tall buildings on the hillside will loom over those lower down the slope, and cast extremely long shadows across all the buildings lower down the hillside in the mornings. - Tosswill road is narrow, fairly steep, and winding. It is unsuitable for heavy / additional traffic. - The bottom of Tamaki street (along with the adjacent lower edge of the proposed zone) is a large steep bank, with steps for pedestrians. Adding vehicle access here would be very difficult. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Importance of community plans and engagement instead of broad brush approach from a distance.	Accept in part	Section 12
1073	FS60.062	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The current development of this area is low-density and relatively widely spaced. Building 6-story blocks in this area would be a dramatic and stark change of character. - The hill is steeply sloping, with Tamaki st having a gradient of around 20%. Tall buildings on the hillside will loom over those lower down the slope, and cast extremely long shadows across all the buildings lower down the hillside in the mornings. - Tosswill road is narrow, fairly steep, and winding. It is unsuitable for heavy / additional traffic. - The bottom of Tamaki street (along with the adjacent lower edge of the proposed zone) is a large steep bank, with steps for pedestrians. Adding vehicle access here would be very difficult. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Importance of community plans and engagement instead of broad brush approach from a distance.	Accept in part	Section 12
1074	S342.002	Christopher Cunningham	Mapping	Oppose in part	If a high-density area is required in Tahunanui, move the proposed High Density zone onto the flat area alongside Tahunanui Drive, between the proposed commercial areas on the west side and in the flat area south of that on the east side.	- These areas already have a more developed character, and high-density housing would fit in better with the proposed taller commercial developments. - Building on the flat would remove the exaggerated looming / shadowing that would result from building on the hill. - As it would be directly on the State Highway, the problems with narrow / winding / steep side streets are avoided.	Accept in part	Section 12
1075	FS61.090	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support in part	Accept in part	The Particular Part of the submission I support in part:- - These areas already have a more developed character, and high-density housing would fit in better with the proposed taller commercial developments. - Building on the flat would remove the exaggerated looming / shadowing that would result from building on the hill. - As it would be directly on the State Highway, the problems with narrow / winding / steep side streets are avoided. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support in part:- Agree with removing HDZ off the Tahunanui hills but query on flats since still awaiting Climate report , similar to the Wood area.	Accept in part	Section 12
1076	FS72.094	Jude Osborne		Support in part	Accept in part	The Particular Part of the submission I support in part:- - These areas already have a more developed character, and high-density housing would fit in better with the proposed taller commercial developments. - Building on the flat would remove the exaggerated looming / shadowing that would result from building on the hill. - As it would be directly on the State Highway, the problems with narrow / winding / steep side streets are avoided. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support in part:- Agree with removing HDZ off the Tahunanui hills but query on flats since still awaiting Climate report , similar to the Wood area.	Accept in part	Section 12

1077	FS60.086	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support in part	Accept in part	The Particular Part of the submission I support in part:- These areas already have a more developed character, and high-density housing would fit in better with the proposed taller commercial developments. - Building on the flat would remove the exaggerated looming / shadowing that would result from building on the hill. - As it would be directly on the State Highway, the problems with narrow / winding / steep side streets are avoided. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support in part:- Agree with removing HDZ off the Tahunanui hills but query on flats since still awaiting Climate report, similar to the Wood area.	Accept in part	Section 12
1078	S343.001	Mark Fielding	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Scrap plan change 29 entirely, diligently study my alternative solutions and discuss all pro's and con's to determine if such solutions will adequately address the projected population increase, then consider allowing a change to the existing in NRMP to allow my solutions [as detailed in submission points 343.002-343.017].	That this proposed plan changed 29 is about providing for future population increase in Nelson and to some extent, to provide more affordable accommodation options. I maintain that the proposals to increase residential density in the examples Illustrated are flawed. That the better more affordable solutions to address population increase and higher densities zoning. My solutions, explained in detail [in the original submission], also demonstrate how the character of Nelson is maintained, how bulk and location rules can be maintained as current, and how all predictions can be fulfilled with very simple and affordable solutions. I am a licensed architectural designer based in Nelson since 1980 with 49 years' experience in the construction industries and with over 30 years as director of my own company. I have completed well over 2000 residential and commercial building projects all over New Zealand. I have received multiple national and local design awards. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12
1079	FS20.017	Tim Bayley		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Scrap plan change 29 entirely, diligently study my alternative solutions and discuss all pro's and con's to determine if such solutions will adequately address the projected population increase, then consider allowing a change to the existing in NRMP to allow my solutions [as detailed in submission points 343.002-343.017]. The reasons for my support: exactly as per Marks points in his submission: That this proposed plan changed 29 is about providing for future population increase in Nelson and to some extent, to provide more affordable accommodation options. I maintain that the proposals to increase residential density in the examples Illustrated are flawed. That the better more affordable solutions to address population increase and higher densities zoning. My solutions, explained in detail [in the original submission], also demonstrate how the character of Nelson is maintained, how bulk and location rules can be maintained as current, and how all predictions can be fulfilled with very simple and affordable solutions. I am a licensed architectural designer based in Nelson since 1980 with 49 years' experience in the construction industries and with over 30 years as director of my own company. I have completed well over 2000 residential and commercial building projects all over New Zealand. I have received multiple national and local design awards.	Reject	Section 12
1080	S343.010	Mark Fielding	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Oppose] any increase in the proportion of rates that are based on land value.	No increase in the proportion of rates that are based on land value, - as land value will not change. However I grant that a second minor dwelling on an existing site with an existing dwelling, would need to be charged rates for infrastructure services and perhaps levies if any.	Reject	Section 13
1081	S343.011	Mark Fielding	Infrastructure	Not Stated	Support for additional buildings to pay a contribution to Infrastructure development levy [inferred].	Acceptability for a contribution to Infrastructure development levy, of say a flat fee of $5000. This is fair as additional buildings in existing residential areas do put pressure on drainage pipes and such and in some cases roads.	Accept	Section 13

1082	S343.016	Mark Fielding	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Council should provide guarantees for loan deposits or lobby banks to allow a 10% deposit or no more than 15k for secondary minor dwellings of up to 60m2 for a two bedroom unit.	This solution is perfect for young families either renting or wanting to own. Perhaps banks could allow a 10% deposit for these buildings or a sliding scale, but either way, deposit amounts could be no more than $15k for a 2BR SMD of 60m2. Perhaps Council could lobby local banks or provide guarantees for such. The Plans included in the appendix of this submission, are for a modular prefabricated building system. A Studio Apartment at 32m2, a 1 BR unit at 43m2, a two bedroom unit at 56m2 and a different 2BR unit at 60m2. These are just some examples of possible designs. These affordable, prefabricated small dwellings can be made from locally milled timber and other local suppliers. Such supply lines keep profits in Nelson and incur the least pressure on the environment through minimal transportation. There are many design variations that can also be built quickly on site - as these are very simple structures. Such modular designs can be adopted so that building size can be increased as needs increase; like with a growing family. While perhaps not suitable for a family with older children, these solutions could adequately house young families for at least 5 years. By that time, with the low accommodation costs, savings and sale of the Secondary Minor Dwelling, a substantial deposit could be realized for a larger home elsewhere in the city. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 11
1083	S343.017	Mark Fielding	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Maintain the existing character of Nelson.	Maintain the existing character of Nelson as we don't want it looking like ChCh, Auckland or Wellington. It is a main reason we all live here.	Reject	Section 12
1084	S344.001	Marion Satherley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S344.002.	Reject	Section 13
1085	FS31.009	Stephen Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1086	FS72.009	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. This plan is out of step with the NZ Central Government's proposed plans for development. The NZ Government has indicated a lack of support for the previous Government's position on densification. Until more direction is given, this has the potential to be a waste of Council and Ratepayers' funds and time following an outdated Central Government brief. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
1087	FS66.011	Carol Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13

1088	FS61.009	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1089	FS76.009	Robert Stevenson(1)		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1090	FS54.009	Nicole Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1091	FS53.009	Susan Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1092	FS46.009	Dan McGuire		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1093	FS77.009	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1094	FS58.009	Robert Stevenson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13

1095	FS60.009	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1096	S344.002	Marion Satherley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1097	S344.003	Marion Satherley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1098	S344.004	Marion Satherley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1099	S344.006	Marion Satherley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S344.005.	Reject	Section 13
1100	S344.010	Marion Satherley	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1101	S344.011	Marion Satherley	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 12
1102	FS28.011	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 in part	Section 12
1103	S344.013	Marion Satherley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13

1104	S344.018	Marion Satherley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S344.005 and S344.011.	Reject	Section 13
1105	S344.019	Marion Satherley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1106	S344.027	Marion Satherley	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
1107	S344.029	Marion Satherley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1108	S344.030	Marion Satherley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1109	S345.001	Leonie Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S345.002.	Reject	Section 13
1110	FS31.010	Stephen Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1111	FS72.010	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. This plan is out of step with the NZ Central Government's proposed plans for development. The NZ Government has indicated a lack of support for the previous Government's position on densification. Until more direction is given, this has the potential to be a waste of Council and Ratepayers' funds and time following an outdated Central Government brief. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9

1112	FS66.012	Carol Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1113	FS61.010	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1114	FS76.010	Robert Stevenson(1)		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1115	FS54.010	Nicole Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1116	FS53.010	Susan Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1117	FS46.010	Dan McGuire		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1118	FS77.010	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13

1119	FS58.010	Robert Stevenson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1120	FS60.010	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1121	S345.002	Leonie Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1122	S345.003	Leonie Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1123	S345.004	Leonie Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1124	S345.006	Leonie Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S345.005.	Reject	Section 13
1125	S345.010	Leonie Allen	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1126	S345.011	Leonie Allen	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 12

1127	FS28.012	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 in part	Section 12
1128	S345.013	Leonie Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
1129	S345.018	Leonie Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S345.005 and S345.011.	Reject	Section 13
1130	S345.019	Leonie Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1131	S345.027	Leonie Allen	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
1132	S345.029	Leonie Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1133	S345.030	Leonie Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1134	S346.001	Daniel Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S346.002.	Reject	Section 13
1135	FS31.011	Stephen Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13

1136	FS72.011	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. This plan is out of step with the NZ Central Government's proposed plans for development. The NZ Government has indicated a lack of support for the previous Government's position on densification. Until more direction is given, this has the potential to be a waste of Council and Ratepayers' funds and time following an outdated Central Government brief. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
1137	FS66.013	Carol Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1138	FS61.011	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1139	FS76.011	Robert Stevenson(1)		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1140	FS54.011	Nicole Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1141	FS53.011	Susan Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13

1142	FS46.011	Dan McGuire		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1143	FS77.011	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1144	FS58.011	Robert Stevenson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1145	FS60.011	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1146	S346.002	Daniel Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1147	S346.003	Daniel Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1148	S346.004	Daniel Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1149	S346.006	Daniel Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S346.005.	Reject	Section 13

1150	S346.010	Daniel Allen	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1151	S346.011	Daniel Allen	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 12
1152	FS28.013	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 in part	Section 12
1153	S346.013	Daniel Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
1154	S346.018	Daniel Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S346.005 and S346.011.	Reject	Section 13
1155	S346.019	Daniel Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1156	S346.027	Daniel Allen	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
1157	S346.029	Daniel Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1158	S346.030	Daniel Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

1159	S347.001	Andrew Herbert & Carol Ward	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Assess] the impact of Plan Change 29 on the natural environment.	We do not believe that the effects of this plan change on the natural environment have been adequately considered or addressed. Intensification in land use, including intensification for residential purposes, inevitably places a greater stress on the natural environment. We do not believe that other than for transport emissions, the impact of this proposed plan change on the natural environment has been adequately assessed. We note that council's Section 32 Evaluation Report contains only seven uses of the term "natural environment" in its 297 pages (compared with 160 references to either "urban environment" or "built environment").	Reject	Section 13
1160	S347.002	Andrew Herbert & Carol Ward	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reassess the underlying assumptions about growth in demand for housing in Nelson with critical input / review by external experts in the field of demographics and related areas.	We do not accept that the assessment of housing development needs in response to future changes such as increases to population, are based on sound information (e.g. demographics, etc) or analysis. Council's evaluation documents (e.g. Housing & Business Capacity Assessment Report 2021) identify a considerable range in possible scenarios for population growth: the rationale for choosing a basis on which to build such a significant change to planning allowances such as Plan 29 is not well justified. Even with the assumptions made within the assessment there are considerable contradictions: the Report 2021 (noted above) describes population growth to 2051 of 11,900 people, a development need of 8,000 dwellings with an occupancy of 2.3 persons per dwelling. Even if the population growth is a correct assessment, this maths does not add up.	Reject	Section 10
1161	S348.001	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S348.002.	Reject	Section 13
1162	S348.002	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1163	S348.003	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1164	S348.004	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1165	S348.006	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S348.005.	Reject	Section 13
1166	S348.010	Rodney Lewis	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12

1167	S348.011	Rodney Lewis	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 12
1168	FS28.014	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 in part	Section 12
1169	S348.013	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
1170	S348.018	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S348.005 and S348.011.	Reject	Section 13
1171	S348.019	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1172	S348.027	Rodney Lewis	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
1173	S348.029	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1174	S348.030	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1175	S348.032	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	The plan change [should] be sent back to the planners and then they should seek public input and take notice of objections before formulating any change.	My reasons are comprehensively spelled out in my submission. But generally, I oppose any intensification that needs major changes to building sizes, site coverage, or changes to daylight provision requirements	Reject	Section 12
1176	FS5.015	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 9

1177	S349.001	Sean Walker	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Do not allow] a new high density zone within walking distance of the city centre.	While I am in support of urban intensification in Nelson I feel that the plan change in its current form lacks detail and vision. A change of this substance will best be developed with the new NBE Act and address all areas of the environment both social and physical. Many people have commented that they live in Nelson for the sunshine. There isn't enough assurance that this has been considered. A high density zone should include open spaces and sun corridors to ensure its livability, or become an urban jungle. High density residential should be led from the inner city zone where effects are less subjective. The proposed plan change would permit anyone with a large enough parcel to build to 19m with little or no guidance on amenity values and aesthetics. I think that a change allowing multiple residential units per title and up to 10m high would be an improvement. Some sunlight controls to ensure the effects of shading are not extreme. Yard setbacks should be done away with and an outdoor living requirement allowing for decks with orientation to the best sun and views. Encourage developers to provide landscaped areas for community use to mitigate higher building height. A sense of community values needs to be brought back into the design brief.	Reject	Section 12
1178	S349.002	Sean Walker	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Address climate change more positively and include dedicated sponge zones, urban forests and green roof initiatives.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
1179	S350.001	Andrew Lush	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons on submission point S350.002.	Reject	Section 13
1180	S350.002	Andrew Lush	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1181	S350.003	Andrew Lush	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1182	S350.004	Andrew Lush	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1183	S350.006	Andrew Lush	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S350.005.	Reject	Section 13
1184	S350.010	Andrew Lush	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1185	S350.011	Andrew Lush	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 12

1186	FS28.015	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 in part	Section 12
1187	S350.013	Andrew Lush	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
1188	S350.018	Andrew Lush	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S350.005 and S350.011.	Reject	Section 13
1189	S350.019	Andrew Lush	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1190	S350.027	Andrew Lush	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
1191	S350.029	Andrew Lush	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1192	S350.030	Andrew Lush	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1193	S352.001	Derek & Karen Austin	Residential Zones	Oppose	We seek that NCC considers the value of protecting residential areas.	We oppose all parts of the Plan Change that deal with "Residential".	Accept in part	Section 12
1194	S352.005	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 12

1195	S352.009	Derek & Karen Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seeks that] Nelson City Council regard it as a priority to have responsible governance around the development of Social Housing Planning. We favour the "pepper pot" approach to social housing so that Kainga Ora tenants have stable community support.	We oppose that the Nelson City Council is able to sell property to Kainga Ora for Social Housing and not have the legal right to be able to carefully plan the location of social housing around the city. Social Housing needs to be planned by the NCC so that ghetto areas do not develop.	Reject	Section 13
1196	S353.001	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons on submission point 002 .	Reject	Section 13
1197	S353.002	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 13
1198	S353.003	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1199	S353.004	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1200	S353.006	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point 004.	Reject	Section 13
1201	S353.010	Rodney Lewis	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Accept	Section 12
1202	S353.011	Rodney Lewis	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 12
1203	FS28.016	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 in part	Section 12
1204	S353.013	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. Eg Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13

1205	S353.018	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point 004.	Reject	Section 13
1206	S353.019	Rodney Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 10
1207	S353.027	Rodney Lewis	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
1208	S354.001	Sally Albrecht	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. I have found PC29's lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council, with its severe implications towards the well being of existing rate paying residents enjoyment of their properties, extremely stressful and unnecessary. The "neighbourhood meetings" set up by NCC failed to address or answer any neighbourhood specific questions but were only for disseminating "high level information" from the Plan Change. These meetings have in no way met the requirement for neighbourhood consultation. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1209	S354.004	Sally Albrecht	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1210	S354.006	Sally Albrecht	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S354.005.	Reject	Section 13
1211	S354.010	Sally Albrecht	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1212	S354.011	Sally Albrecht	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 12

1213	FS28.017	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 in part	Section 12
1214	S354.013	Sally Albrecht	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
1215	S354.019	Sally Albrecht	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1216	S354.027	Sally Albrecht	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
1217	S354.029	Sally Albrecht	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1218	S354.030	Sally Albrecht	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1219	S354.031	Sally Albrecht	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include protection of current green spaces AND create a plan for the provision of additonal shared green spaces in all/any increased density zones.	With increased density housing and possibly apartment living, increased community green spaces/outdoor lounges are essential.	Reject	Section 11
1220	S355.004	Bernard Penketh	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 S355.001. The possibility of a 19.5m tall "Kainga Ora" building going up in Neale Avenue would, in my opinion, be bad news for Stoke and its people. If this plan goes ahead I could potentially have a 12m high residence on the property to the north of me, all my sun and views gone.	Accept in part	Section 12
1221	S355.006	Bernard Penketh	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S355.001 and S355.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
1222	S355.007	Bernard Penketh	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13

1223	S355.008	Bernard Penketh	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
1224	S355.011	Bernard Penketh	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Restrict] uncoordinated site by site development and [amend rules to] have good design which blends in.	I agree with local architects, remove uncoordinated site by site developments, have good design which blends in.	Accept in part	Section 12
1225	S356.002	Sarah Yarrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Require the development of neighbourhood plans.	To ensure that development in the new residential zones is fit for purpose and has community input. Blanket rules will result in ad hoc development with no carefully designed shape and form in existing residential neighbourhoods. Requiring neighbourhood plans means that development can happen in a planned and staged way, with the input of the local community.	Reject	Section 13
1226	S356.003	Sarah Yarrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Prioritise intensification within the inner city and city fringe zones and remove High Density and Medium Density residential zones.	Intensify housing in areas closest to the inner city first. Lets see how that goes before moving into well established low rise residential zones. This will also allow time for development of neighbourhood plans to better plan for intensified residential development.	Accept in part	Section 12
1227	S356.004	Sarah Yarrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Bring in rules to utilise housing stock in Nelson that sits empty for part or all of the time (second homes that are vacant, Air BnBs etc).	There is a housing allocation problem in New Zealand because we treat housing as a capital asset to make money off rather than a fundamental human need/right. There are hundreds of houses in Nelson that sit empty or mostly empty as second homes, Air BnBs etc. The Council should investigate (and advocate nationally) for what rules it could bring in to manage for this and free up this housing. I'm sure there are examples from other countries we could learn from.	Reject	Section 13
1228	S356.005	Sarah Yarrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff torefine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	I have found it difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity and have hoped that residents with more time and expertise in this area will make more comprehensive submissions covering my concerns as to the future of Nelson and its ratepaying residents. I think PC 29 is missing key steps and elements in its development (such as neighbourhood plans) that would address a lot of my concerns and therefore has been prematurely put out for public submissions.	Reject	Section 13
1229	S359.001	Gabriele Kraft	Mapping	Oppose	[Rezone] the entire Tahunanui Hills area as General Residential.	Apart from obvious individual concerns regarding loss in property value (we suspect for many, like us, this would be our most significant asset) as impacted by potential loss of views and sunshine, those of us who actually live in this area see a significant increase in housing density here as defying all logic. We note that areas proposed for an increase in housing density require proximity to amenities, low natural hazard risk and convenient transport access. While it could be argued that this area has access to Tahunanui Primary School by crossing the busy State Highway 6, the area is a fail on all other counts, as residents here would affirm. The area here is hillside - this may not be evident when looking at a map on a computer screen. It was very evident in the atmospheric river that passed Nelson last year when the hill above lower Tosswill yielded two slips, closing access into the neighbourhood. (This is directly below the area proposed for High density housing.) Historically, in the early 80's or late 70's, a slip inundated a house below Chamberlain, towards the Mairi end of the street, which (from memory) may even have resulted in a fatality. The existing storm water provisions have already demonstrated over time that they are not always adequate for the existing homes, never mind adding to the issue with even more of our permeable green spaces covered with the proposed structures. The streets in our neighbourhood are for the most part narrow and winding. The last thing we need is for the volume to be increased again as a result of more dwellings packed into this area, once again challenging the safety of current residents. Current new parking bylaws, by which off-street parking provisions are not required in new builds, will further exacerbate the	Accept	Section 12

1230	FS61.067	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Apart from obvious individual concerns regarding loss in property value (we suspect for many, like us, this would be our most significant asset) as impacted by potential loss of views and sunshine, those of us who actually live in this area see a significant increase in housing density here as defying all logic. We note that areas proposed for an increase in housing density require proximity to amenities, low natural hazard risk and convenient transport access. While it could be argued that this area has access to Tahunanui Primary School by crossing the busy State Highway 6, the area is a fail on all other counts, as residents here would affirm. The area here is hillside - this may not be evident when looking at a map on a computer screen. It was very evident in the atmospheric river that passed Nelson last year when the hill above lower Tosswill yielded two slips, closing access into the neighbourhood. (This is directly below the area proposed for High density housing.) Historically, in the early 80's or late 70's, a slip inundated a house below Chamberlain, towards the Mairi end of the street, which (from memory) may even have resulted in a fatality. The existing storm water provisions have already demonstrated over time that they are not always adequate for the existing homes, never mind adding to the issue with even more of our permeable green spaces covered with the proposed structures. The streets in our neighbourhood are for the most part narrow and winding. The last thing we need is for the volume to be increased again as a result of more dwellings packed into this area, once again challenging the safety of current residents. Current new parking bylaws, by which off-street parking provisions are not required in new builds, will further	Accept in part	Section 12
1231	FS72.071	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Apart from obvious individual concerns regarding loss in property value (we suspect for many, like us, this would be our most significant asset) as impacted by potential loss of views and sunshine, those of us who actually live in this area see a significant increase in housing density here as defying all logic. We note that areas proposed for an increase in housing density require proximity to amenities, low natural hazard risk and convenient transport access. While it could be argued that this area has access to Tahunanui Primary School by crossing the busy State Highway 6, the area is a fail on all other counts, as residents here would affirm. The area here is hillside - this may not be evident when looking at a map on a computer screen. It was very evident in the atmospheric river that passed Nelson last year when the hill above lower Tosswill yielded two slips, closing access into the neighbourhood. (This is directly below the area proposed for High density housing.) Historically, in the early 80's or late 70's, a slip inundated a house below Chamberlain, towards the Mairi end of the street, which (from memory) may even have resulted in a fatality. The existing storm water provisions have already demonstrated over time that they are not always adequate for the existing homes, never mind adding to the issue with even more of our permeable green spaces covered with the proposed structures. The streets in our neighbourhood are for the most part narrow and winding. The last thing we need is for the volume to be increased again as a result of more dwellings packed into this area, once again challenging the safety of current residents. Current new parking bylaws, by which off-street parking provisions are not required in new builds, will further	Accept in part	Section 12

1232	FS60.063	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Apart from obvious individual concerns regarding loss in property value (we suspect for many, like us, this would be our most significant asset) as impacted by potential loss of views and sunshine, those of us who actually live in this area see a significant increase in housing density here as defying all logic. We note that areas proposed for an increase in housing density require proximity to amenities, low natural hazard risk and convenient transport access. While it could be argued that this area has access to Tahunanui Primary School by crossing the busy State Highway 6, the area is a fail on all other counts, as residents here would affirm. The area here is hillside - this may not be evident when looking at a map on a computer screen. It was very evident in the atmospheric river that passed Nelson last year when the hill above lower Tosswill yielded two slips, closing access into the neighbourhood. (This is directly below the area proposed for High density housing.) Historically, in the early 80's or late 70's, a slip inundated a house below Chamberlain, towards the Mairi end of the street, which (from memory) may even have resulted in a fatality. The existing storm water provisions have already demonstrated over time that they are not always adequate for the existing homes, never mind adding to the issue with even more of our permeable green spaces covered with the proposed structures. The streets in our neighbourhood are for the most part narrow and winding. The last thing we need is for the volume to be increased again as a result of more dwellings packed into this area, once again challenging the safety of current residents. Current new parking bylaws, by which off-street parking provisions are not required in new builds, will further	Accept in part	Section 10
1233	S359.002	Gabriele Kraft	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Rather than taking a broad brush approach to housing intensification here in Nelson, look at site specific solutions that would take into consideration the topography/geology of each area, impact on current residents, aesthetics and maximizing sun angles.	While there appears to be a shortage of housing/rental homes here in Nelson, I also agree that it makes no sense to be ever-expanding into our green spaces. It also makes sense to provide homes where people have easy access to amenities without always relying on single occupant vehicles. In a city of our size and character six story apartments have no place in any of our residential areas. As sections become available, consider low-level townhouses (no more than two stories high), or terraced homes on stable hillsides. Encourage neighbourhood engagement and design competitions. While there are not many larger sections left in our city, there are a few that would be suitable for subdivision or for accommodating more homes - not 3 story monstrosities, but tasteful homes that would blend with the existing character of each neighbourhood. Currently there are numerous costs, red-tape and barriers facing property owners who could potentially provide for more housing on existing sections. Perhaps the council could offer support, both financial and technical to allow for more homes to be built on these sections. This could include provisions for creative solutions such as encouraging the building of tiny houses and granny flats with support from the council for access, retaining walls, drainage, sewer, fresh water and power.	Reject	Section 10
1234	S360.001	Colin McBright	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose Plan Change 29.	I support the plan to increase intensification of housing in Nelson to reduce urban sprawl. I am opposed to Plan Change 29 for two reasons: 1) Building of six stories are too high for Nelson and there should be a maximum of 3 stories. 2) It is not appropriate for developers to build properties without resource consent as neighbours should be consulted if a high property will affect their property.	Reject	Section 12

1235	S361.004	Michael Scott	Mapping	Amend	Amend the mapping over the area of the Railway Reserve through Nelson South to Open Space zone.	Nelson South does not have zoned areas of Open Space, apart from a very small playground next to Nelson South kindergarten, which is not fit for purpose, especially given the increasing density that the plan change will enable. The Railway Reserve is heavily used by the community as a linear park. It is a world-class active transport link between Stoke and the Nelson CBD, provides opportunities for exercise, fresh air and quiet contemplation for those living in the area. It also links Victory Primary School, Victory Community Centre, Nelson Intermediate School and businesses in the Victory suburban commercial centre to the community they serve. This should be recognised on the council planning maps.	Accept in part	Section 12
1236	S363.001	Scott Williamson	Entire Plan Change	Support	Adopt proposed plan 29 in its current for or with as little change as is necessary.	1) its a bold move. I support bold moves as incramentalism is rarely successful in the the policy development process or space. 2) NIMBY has to yield to the greater good. If we NEVER allowed changes to impact n anyone we'd still be living in caves supporting the flint makers guild. There is no parato optimal solutions to the issues facing humanity. 3) I want to see no more farmland going under housing. Berrylands in the TDC is an abomination and insult to our needs for food in the future. 4) Nelson as a city will die if we don't densify.	Accept in part	Section 9
1237	FS65.136	Heritage Nelson		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Adopt entire plan in present form. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
1238	FS78.146	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Adopt entire plan in present form. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. A new study on effects of proposals on heritage and character of City is required.	Reject	Section 12
1239	FS78.433	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Reject	Section 12
1240	S364.001	Christopher White	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support Plan Change 29 and if possible provide some oversight by urban designers to ensure that the result is a harmonious and pleasant city.	To avoid more sprawl on fertile farmland. More housing for increasing population. Easier for walking and biking options. More people living in the inner city will bring vitality and help retailers. Update housing stock and add more choice in housing.	Accept in part	Section 13
1241	FS65.137	Heritage Nelson		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Adopt entire plan with urban design oversight. 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 in part	Section 12
1242	FS78.147	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Adopt entire plan with urban design oversight. 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 12
1243	FS78.434	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Various. PC29 has the potential to seriously affect the character of Nelson, a key attribute with economic, social and environmental consequences.	Reject	Section 12

1244	S366.001	Athol Webster	Mapping	Oppose	[Amend the zoning of] Chamberlain Street, Toswill Road and Maire Street neighbourhood to General Residential as opposed to Medium or High Density Residential.	1. Some of our neighbourhood has hazard identification overlays on council files that indicate risk of slip damage. Our house is not affected but directly over the road is affected by this as well as nearby properties. 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. 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]	Reject	Section 12
1245	FS61.069	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- [Amend the zoning of] Chamberlain Street, Toswill Road and Maire Street neighbourhood to General Residential as opposed to Medium or High Density Residential. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Tahunanui Hills isn't suitable to MDZ or HDZ.	Accept in part	Section 12
1246	FS72.073	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- [Amend the zoning of] Chamberlain Street, Toswill Road and Maire Street neighbourhood to General Residential as opposed to Medium or High Density Residential. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Tahunanui Hills isn't suitable to MDZ or HDZ.	Accept in part	Section 12
1247	FS60.065	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- [Amend the zoning of] Chamberlain Street, Toswill Road and Maire Street neighbourhood to General Residential as opposed to Medium or High Density Residential. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Tahunanui Hills isn't suitable to MDZ or HDZ.	Accept in part	Section 12
1248	S368.002	Philip McKinlay	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zones area from 25 Bronte Street and either;	If Council does go ahead with Plan Change 29, I would like to submit on the following specific issues, which particularly concern and affect me: Loss of sunlight, daylight and outlook. a. 25 Bronte Street currently has access to all-day sun, daylight and a northerly view over the city and out to sea. b. Under Plan Change 29 the majority of the residential area to the north of the property and to the South of Christ Church Cathedral, is zoned HIGH DENSITY, which allows for building of up to 6 stories to be constructed up to one metre from the boundary of neighbouring properties with no protection of existing daylight, sunlight or outlook. c. 25 Bronte Street is a rear section and is surrounded by seven immediate properties (see "attachment 1, 25 Bronte Street, Surrounding Properties"), all of which are zoned HIGH DENSITY under Plan Change 29. If Plan Change 29 is not stopped, these seven surrounding properties can be built up to six stories under the HIGH DENSITY zone and fully block our sun, daylight and outlook. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12

1249	S368.003	Philip McKinlay	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	Reject/ withdraw the plan change in its entirety. If it is not rejected [amend to reflect submission points S368.001 - S368.029.	I want to voice the following concerns: a. I find that the promotion of PC29 by the Council has been misleading in that it implies that it is the only option available AND that it is required by law. The plan is not the only option and Nelson is not required to provide for high-density housing. b. I also feel that there appears to be a level of defensiveness in the discussions of the plan, by the Mayor and the planning staff, (which is understandable as they want to defend the work they have completed) but the point of the consultation process is to receive feedback. c. The Council appears to have ignored the" Nelson-Tasman Housing We'd Choose - Housing Demand Preferences". Report in assessing the factors for PC29, which indicates to me that it has "cherry picked" the information that supports its pre-determined outcomes. d. That I have found it difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. e. That access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made freely available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer, or prefer to have access to printed material. f. That I have found PC 29's lack of early public engagement and consultation by Nelson City Council, (with its severe implications towards the well-being of existing rate paying residents enjoyment of their properties), extremely stressful and unnecessary. g. That I have been put in a position of hoping more qualified citizens than I will make more comprehensive submissions covering my concerns as to the future of Nelson and its rate paying residents. h. That PC 29 appears to have been designed as a "broad brush" approach that requires public submissions to refine the plan. Such a statement	Accept in part	Section 9
1250	S368.004	Philip McKinlay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	I strongly disagree with the make-up of the hearing panel commissioners because of the public (and my) perception that it is "biased". This was following the vote Councillor Mel Courtney moved at the 14th September 2023 Council meeting, that the council withdraw Plan Change 29 and instead consult on it as a draft document. The current two commissioners on the panel are Roahn O'Neill- Stevens and Trudie Brand (both of whom voted against Mel Courtney's motion to withdraw Plan Change 29 and instead consult on it as a draft document). It is also worth noting that of the 12 votes on Councillor Mel Courtney's motion, 5 were for and 7 against. In contrast to this voting outcome, as indicated by the numerous public meetings I have attended, there appears to be at least 90% of rate payers who would have voted For Councillor Courtney's motion. This is one area where I have found the Mayor's public response to be defensive and intransient. He does not seem willing to even consider a challenge to his selection.	Reject	Section 13
1251	S368.005	Philip McKinlay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The population growth forecasts are pivotal to the scale of the plan, which Nelson needs to adopt to enable intensification and growth. The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ. In addition to the concerns as to whether the correct population growth statistics have been used the proposed plan appears to accommodate even more growth than is expected on these "inflated" projections.	Reject	Section 10
1252	S368.009	Philip McKinlay	Mapping	Amend	[Request] Council to re-apply the current General Residential Zone across the entire Nelson district, 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.	As previously stated, I reject everything about Plan Change 29, 100% in it entirety. It is not in character or in keeping with the existing 'General Residential Zone". c. Bigger older properties, could be better utilised and help with our growth if they were more easily allowed to be divided into multi-dwellings. f. Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Reject	Section 12

1253	S368.014	Philip McKinlay	Residential Zones	Not Stated	[Request] Council work 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.	a. Significant care and attention must be considered with all social housing to ensure it is well integrated into the community and that the residents have their social needs supported because there are too many examples across the country where this has resulted in disharmony in communities. b. High density living for the homeless and vulnerable will not result in healthy outcomes for all concerned. c 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
1254	S368.015	Philip McKinlay	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1255	S368.016	Philip McKinlay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Request] that Nelson City Council carries out an independent. "Visual Pollution Assessment" (VPA) immediately, based on the proposed new zoning areas under Plan Change 29.	I am referring to the visible deterioration and negative aesthetic quality of human-made landscapes caused by the implementation of the proposed Plan Change 29. The resulting EYESORE, could easily shave a 10% to 20% discount off affected residential properties. People will flee the city, in want of less visually polluted areas, which of course is exactly the OPPOSITE of what the proposed Plan Change 29 intended! Without a VPA the new density areas will be left to developer's discretion and Nelson City will become a national eyesore, rather than a city with a consistent pattern of development.	Reject	Section 13
1256	S368.017	Philip McKinlay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to the reasons in submission points S368.005 & S368.006.	Reject	Section 13
1257	S368.022	Philip McKinlay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S368.006, S368.007 and S368.009.	Reject	Section 13
1258	S368.024	Philip McKinlay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe.	To accommodate the "expected" population growth the Council should take a staged approach to intensification. a. Firstly, the Inner City - Centre (North of the Cathedral in pale blue on the Plan map) should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods; this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. ... b. Secondly, the Inner City - Fringe (also in blue on the plan map) could be the next zone to phase in for intensification.	Reject	Section 10
1259	S371.003	Janet Moloney	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Encourage high density housing in the CBD.	Refer to the reasons in S371.001.	Accept	Section 12

1260	S373.001	Samuel Ng	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Revoke Plan Change 29 and favour a longer, more community-centric engagement process to address housing affordability in Nelson, comprehensively based on objective evidence of population growth, including the residential preferences of the growing population.	Key reasons are summarised as follows: Shading and Privacy Concerns: IThe potential blockage of sunlight due to taller developments can significantly affect the well-being, comfort, and energy efficiency of neighboring homes, while also potentially diminishing property values (see below for all references). Additionally, the lack of privacy from closely built high-rise buildings can lead to a sense of intrusion and loss of personal space, undermining the serene and community-centered character that currently defines our neighborhoods. Need for Sustainable Intensification: An inclusive approach towards housing intensification, considering the diverse needs and concerns of the community, can lead to more sustainable urban development. Community Engagement: This deficiency in engagement could lead to decisions that may not reflect the collective aspirations or address the concerns of the community, hence undermining the social cohesion and shared vision for the neighborhood's future. Inadequate Publicity and Notification: Despite this substantial impact, there has not been sufficient publicity to ensure that residents are adequately informed. Complexity of Online Documents and Short Consultation Period: The documents pertaining to PC29, available online, present a challenge in comprehension, and the consultation timeframe provided is inadequate given the magnitude of the proposed changes. Inconsistencies with Previous Proposals: These inconsistencies not only create misunderstanding but also cast doubt on the coherence of the planning process. Ambiguity and Miscommunication: The use of broad terms and the lack of clarity in delineating areas subjected to intensification makes it exceedingly	Accept in part	Section 13
1261	S374.001	Kathryn Ng	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Revoke Plan Change 29 and favor a longer, more community-centric engagement process to address housing affordability in Nelson comprehensively based on objective evidence of population growth, including the residential preferences of the growing population.	I support the concept of intensification, recognizing its importance in providing diverse housing choices in certain city regions to counteract urban sprawl and cater to our growing population. However, I have concerns regarding the present iteration of Plan29 [summarised as follows]: - Infrastructural challenges. - Social impact. - Building requirements and the impact of loss of privacy and sunlight. - Energy efficiency, related to loss of sunlight access. - Family neighbourhoods will feel less safe with the invasion of privacy that is possible with a multi-storey building next door - It is unnecessary to to intensify in areas that are within walking distance to Nelson city given the population projections. - Some residents will be disproportionately impacted. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1262	S374.002	Kathryn Ng	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Limit intensification to the commercial city-centre and recognise that Nelson's charm is its neighbourhoods.	1. Nelson IS its communities - we chose Nelson over more practical places to live because we wish our children to float between neighbours houses; because we want to be the cheery smile for the elderly gentleman on our street; or to start WhatsApp groups when our street goes into lockdown 2. Preserving Nelson's charm - the benefits and charm of a smaller, regional town are one of the compelling draw cards for migration to Nelson and brings in droves of tourists. The greenery and open spaces, away from the bustling urban environment typical of larger cities, makes Nelson special. High-rise buildings towering over existing family homes would significantly detract from this. Less tourists means less income into the city. Done poorly, intensification could be a death null to our city. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12

1263	S374.010	Kathryn Ng	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Provide further information and make it easy for residents to come up to speed with current thinking to be meaningfully consulted and engaged.	The need for affordable housing is not in dispute. But if we are to come on board in support of initiatives we need to know: - what the council has learned from other councils and options inside and outside of NZ - other housing options that are being explored or implemented alongside this, especially as intensification feels like it is a long lead time to an immediate and pressing need - the basis for the future forecasts and how the council will respond to concerns raised. Council should respond to the above questions directly. Council mechanisms for connecting with the Nelson community are clearly blunt. Nelson residents are better informed about roadworks than a rule change that may result in a multi-storey building next door. This needs to change. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1264	S376.001	Trevor James	Entire Plan Change	Support	Allow for medium and high density zones, but ensure that there are neighbourhood plans to get the detailed design right.	If done right we believe the 3-6 story apartments are very attractive and very 'livable'. Done right, shops, public transport, pools, parks and other amenities can be within a short walking distance. Often this can mean that friends and family can be closer. Ideally if this is done well it leaves more room for nature. The current model of urban growth is unsustainable and leads to inefficient servicing, environmental degradation and wasteful of productive land. The current model is driven by our society's demand for using motor vehicles. Our specific concerns about the current situation is: - Impervious surface. In our current urban areas there is a large amount of tarsealed road/driveway, roof and concrete surface covering our land. - Limited green space for nature. - Unsustainable transportation. With sprawling, low density urban areas and low usage of public transport mean the vehicle kilometers travelled per person is greater and therefore the pollution we create from vehicles is high. - High Costs and low efficiency. Pipework and pumping systems for drinking water, wastewater and stormwater is more expensive the more spread out and less dense the developments are. Public transport is also less efficient and costly as urban areas spread out in many directions. - Limited housing options. There need to be more smaller housing options for example for single people, young couples and older folk. - Pressure on productive land and to reduce space for nature in rural areas. - More variety permitted in dwelling eg spaces created for tiny house villages We like this plan as it addresses these problems. While we support this plan change, any intensification needs to be designed well. This means that multi-story buildings should integrate well with the landscape (topography,	Accept in part	Section 12

1265	S377.001	Myfanwy James	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support Plan Change 29, but ensure any intensification is designed well and ensure it is addressed in comprehensive Neighbourhood Plans.	If done right we believe the 3-6 story apartments are very attractive and very 'livable'. Done right, shops, public transport, pools, parks and other amenities can be within a short walking distance. Often this can mean that friends and family can be closer. Ideally if this is done well it leaves more room for nature. The current model of urban growth is unsustainable and leads to inefficient servicing, environmental degradation and wasteful of productive land. The current model is driven by our society's demand for using motor vehicles. Our specific concerns about the current situation is: - Impervious surface. In our current urban areas there is a large amount of tarsealed road/driveway, roof and concrete surface covering our land. - Limited green space for nature. - Unsustainable transportation. With sprawling, low density urban areas and low usage of public transport mean the vehicle kilometers travelled per person is greater and therefore the pollution we create from vehicles is high. - High Costs and low efficiency. Pipework and pumping systems for drinking water, wastewater and stormwater is more expensive the more spread out and less dense the developments are. Public transport is also less efficient and costly as urban areas spread out in many directions. - Limited housing options. There need to be more smaller housing options for example for single people, young couples and older folk. - Pressure on productive land and to reduce space for nature in rural areas. - More variety permitted in dwelling eg spaces created for tiny house villages We like this plan as it addresses these problems. While we support this plan change, any intensification needs to be designed well. This means that multi-story buildings should integrate well with the landscape (topography,	Accept in part	Section 12
1266	S379.001	Carole-Ann Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Review and redesign Plan Change 29.	The public was not given any voice on how intensification was to be managed.	Reject	Section 10
1267	S379.006	Carole-Ann Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Provide] adequate sewage and water drainage for the extra housing.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1268	S379.008	Carole-Ann Lewis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Use] empty buildings in the city for housing.	There are many empty buildings in the city that could be changed and used for housing.	Reject	Section 13
1269	S380.001	Sharon Bryce	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan 29 in its current form.	I'm very concerned about the physical and social effects that such a plan will have on established residential properties and the future look and feel of our town. Any plan that leaves the spatial configuration of new multi-storey buildings to pure chance or to the whim of the developer, is bound to lead to disappointing results with unintended consequences that will be hard if not impossible to come back from. I acknowledge there is a degree of need regarding residential housing but I question the lack of vision, the degree of change and the one size fits all approach that is Plan 29. Plan 29 in its current form will have adverse affects for both existing residents and the new residents alike - albeit in different ways. There must be an intensification vision and threshold that can satisfy the demands of homes for people without abandoning the people. There has not been enough thought put in or conversation had about the social implications of such radical intensification including mental health and wellbeing. I do not see how stacking families on top of each other with only the streets and/ or public spaces to play constitutes a healthy environment. I'm not convinced that the goals of revitalising the city and large scale residential housing in and near the CBD are compatible with each other and in reality could work against each other. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 9

1270	S380.002	Sharon Bryce	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Design comprehensive neighbourhood plans first.	Evidently our current Future Development Strategy spells out the need for neighbourhood plans in the first instance. Such plans will give some certainty about the form and location of future buildings, open space areas for outlook and privacy, future public and private green spaces, play areas etc. With a clear picture in mind, the community will be much more at ease about the changes. You will bring the people with you and not exacerbate divisions.	Reject	Section 13
1271	S380.007	Sharon Bryce	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Provide a fair balance of developers offering residential builds catering to a broad spectrum of the market.	I'd like to see any Plan we adopt ensure and make explicit that there is a fair balance of developers offering residential builds for all those who are in the market for it from families to the retired. I'd like to see a plan that achieves a sympathetic blending of residential into the city without bringing about unintended social consequences. Plan 29 does not do this.	Reject	Section 12
1272	S380.008	Sharon Bryce	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose] the proposed new zones as they currently stand.	I think the High Density area spreads too far into established residential zones and the new height suggestions are completely incompatible with what already exists except for in the CBD and possibly fringe commercial/industrial areas which I think ought not exceed 4 stories. I question the need for a medium density zone at all and once again the new height suggestions would have too great an impact on existing residences. I think the proposed zones are an example of one size fits all which I am opposed to.	Accept in part	Section 12
1273	S381.001	Peter Sheppard	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw Plan Change 29 entirely and present to the people of Nelson some new options that enable intensification of housing, with less impact on existing residents and with better planning in general.	I disagree with the approach of earmarking entire blocks of land for zoning change, based mainly on 'proximity to amenities' as described by planners at the public meeting held by NCC at the Trafalgar Centre some weeks ago. I see this approach as too narrow in its scope and it appears to ignore potential impact on existing residents and fails to recognize the topography of the land, the nature of the roading and the existing natural hazards in some of these areas. We are the owners of 66 Tosswill Rd. If Plan Change 29 went ahead in its current form, this will enable our neighbour on our North boundary to build to 12m; this height of build would effectively put us in shade from approximately 8.00am to 1.00pm or later and would block our outlook to the north also. This would have a very negative effect on our lifestyle and possibly health. Directly across the road the proposed change would enable building to 19.5m. The idea of buildings of this height and covering a large area as proposed along Tosswill Rd and down Tamaki Rd is quite disturbing to us as existing residents, for the following reasons: - Shading would be a big issue for as at this height, as well as a large loss of outlook to the sea and the mountains. Even the uncertainty of whether development with these types of negative impacts would create anxiety for us as a family, should the Plan Change 29 changes be adopted in their current form. - Natural Hazards are also an issue in the Tahunanui area; well documented flooding and subsequent land subsidence alone we would see as a very good reason for intensification of housing as afforded by Plan Change 29 to be recognized as a flawed concept. - Transportation is also an issue. Tosswill Rd and other streets in the area are already down to single lane and quite	Reject	Section 9

1274	FS72.023	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Natural Hazards are also an issue in the Tahunanui area; well documentedflooding and subsequent land subsidence alone we would see as a very good reason for intensification of housing as afforded by Plan Change 29 to be recognized as a flawed concept. - Transportation is also an issue. Tosswill Rd and other streets in the area are already down to single lane and quite hazardous on a daily basis with just a single vehicle parked on the roadside. Creation of large apartment blocks and intensification in general will only exacerbate this issue - which is a serious safety issue in this area. - Infrastructure is lacking and both stormwater and sewage systems in the Tahunanui Hills appear to be old and inadequate. The need for upgrading of these services to accommodate more residents appears to have been overlooked. - Amenities in terms of a supermarket are not readily available close to Tahunanui Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support: The quality of residents lifestyle, should not be impaired the very idea of taking away peoples ability to utilise their outdoor living space and sustainable growth of gardens, especially during a cost of living crisis is absolutely unacceptable. The broad brush approach adopted to including an area for development in Tahunanui has missed the mark on so many ways, it is not close to Public Transport, shops or amenities, the whole of tahunanui has poor stormwater & sewage infrastructure and has stability map overlays for instability.	Accept in part	Section 12
1275	FS61.023	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Natural Hazards are also an issue in the Tahunanui area; well documented flooding and subsequent land subsidence alone we would see as a very good reason for intensification of housing as afforded by Plan Change 29 to be recognized as a flawed concept. - Transportation is also an issue. Tosswill Rd and other streets in the area are already down to single lane and quite hazardous on a daily basis with just a single vehicle parked on the roadside. Creation of large apartment blocks and intensification in general will only exacerbate this issue - which is a serious safety issue in this area. - Infrastructure is lacking and both stormwater and sewage systems in the Tahunanui Hills appear to be old and inadequate. The need for upgrading of these services to accommodate more residents appears to have been overlooked. - Amenities in terms of a supermarket are not readily available close to Tahunanui. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support The quality of residents lifestyle, should not be impaired the very idea of taking away peoples ability to utilise their outdoor living space and sustainable growth of gardens, especially during a cost of living crisis is absolutely unacceptable. The broad brush approach adopted to including an area for development in Tahunanui has missed the mark on so many ways, it is not close to Public Transport, shops or amenities, the whole of tahunanui has poor stormwater & sewage infrastructure and has stability map overlays for instability.	Accept in part	Section 12

1276	FS60.025	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Natural Hazards are also an issue in the Tahunanui area; well documented flooding and subsequent land subsidence alone we would see as a very good reason for intensification of housing as afforded by Plan Change 29 to be recognized as a flawed concept. - Transportation is also an issue. Tosswill Rd and other streets in the area are already down to single lane and quite hazardous on a daily basis with just a single vehicle parked on the roadside. Creation of large apartment blocks and intensification in general will only exacerbate this issue - which is a serious safety issue in this area. - Infrastructure is lacking and both stormwater and sewage systems in the Tahunanui Hills appear to be old and inadequate. The need for upgrading of these services to accommodate more residents appears to have been overlooked. - Amenities in terms of a supermarket are not readily available close to Tahunanui. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support: The quality of residents lifestyle, should not be impaired the very idea of taking away peoples ability to utilise their outdoor living space and sustainable growth of gardens, especially during a cost of living crisis is absolutely unacceptable. The broad brush approach adopted to including an area for development in Tahunanui has missed the mark on so many ways, it is not close to Public Transport, shops or amenities, the whole of tahunanui has poor stormwater & sewage infrastructure and has stability map overlays for instability.	Accept in part	Section 12
1277	S381.002	Peter Sheppard	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Alternatively] make changes that would give scope for building to the parameters suggested in Plan Change 29 - on a site by site basis, anywhere in the city, in consultation with existing residents.	However, I would suggest a more nuanced approach to creating more housing options across Nelson. Some sites will always lend themselves to development more than others.	Accept in part	Section 12
1278	S382.001	Anthony Healey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Revisit Plan Change 29 with an area by area design.	No information has been taken into account from previous geotech reports. All it does is lump groups into tier 2 blanket zones. This submission relates to Andy Whiting Place land. It will create increases in insurance premiums, or denial of insurance cover. It has not taken into account previous weather events, where areas not damaged. Property values will fall. Extensions will be difficult.	Accept in part	Section 12
1279	FS49.008	Suffolk Heights Limited		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: All parts. The generic matter in which the slope risk overlays have been proposed will, as a consequence, have significant and unreasonable impacts on property owners. The costs of these changes have not been adequately assessed under section 32 of the Act. The provisions are therefore considered to be inappropriate.	Reject	Section 12
1280	S383.004	Karin Harrison	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 S383.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
1281	S383.006	Karin Harrison	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S383.001 and S383.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
1282	S383.007	Karin Harrison	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
1283	S383.008	Karin Harrison	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
1284	S384.001	Arif Matthee	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S384.002.	Reject	Section 13

1285	S384.002	Arif Matthee	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1286	S384.003	Arif Matthee	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1287	S384.004	Arif Matthee	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1288	S384.006	Arif Matthee	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S384.005.	Reject	Section 13
1289	S384.010	Arif Matthee	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1290	S384.011	Arif Matthee	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 12
1291	FS28.018	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 in part	Section 12
1292	S384.013	Arif Matthee	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
1293	S384.018	Arif Matthee	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S384.005 and S384.011.	Reject	Section 13

1294	S384.019	Arif Matthee	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1295	S384.027	Arif Matthee	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
1296	S384.029	Arif Matthee	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1297	S384.030	Arif Matthee	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1298	S386.004	Eric Peter	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 S386.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
1299	S386.006	Eric Peter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S386.001 and S386.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
1300	S386.007	Eric Peter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
1301	S386.008	Eric Peter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
1302	S387.004	David Bennett	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Delete the] High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 12 m.	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 S387.001. The plan change is out of "context" with what could be considered a beautiful and functional city. The proposed building heights do not fit with the wishes of the populace. The extent of the high density area is too large and does not fit with the outcomes residents wish for. Refer to original submission for more detail.	Accept in part	Section 12
1303	S387.006	David Bennett	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S387.001 and S387.004.	Accept in part	Section 12
1304	S387.007	David Bennett	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety. The plan change has been brought about by (as I understand) a recognition of the NPS for Urban Development which is mandatory for Tier 1 cities but only voluntary for Tier 2 cities. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9

1305	S387.010	David Bennett	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Consult with the public for input into the design first].	While it is understood that consideration needs to be made for future development, the "consultation" process has been reversed, whereby the public should have had input into the design and not the other way around [where] council has come up with a design which is pushes around with comments that it is "consultation" and you will be able to have your say. Then the council comes back later and say[s] you didn't object or comment at the first stage.	Reject	Section 13
1306	S388.001	Gary Calderbank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S388.002.	Reject	Section 13
1307	S388.002	Gary Calderbank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. NCC appears to have failed to take account of the findings of the report commissioned by NCC and TDC in 2021 called Housing We'd Chose by m.e Consulting (Document reference: TDC 002.21 HWC Tasman Nelson) which analyses housing preferences of the population. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1308	S388.003	Gary Calderbank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1309	S388.004	Gary Calderbank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1310	S388.006	Gary Calderbank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S388.005.	Reject	Section 13
1311	S388.010	Gary Calderbank	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1312	S388.011	Gary Calderbank	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 12
1313	FS28.019	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 in part	Section 12
1314	S388.013	Gary Calderbank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. Eg Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13

1315	S388.019	Gary Calderbank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1316	S388.027	Gary Calderbank	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.	Reject	Section 13
1317	S388.029	Gary Calderbank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1318	S388.030	Gary Calderbank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1319	S388.034	Gary Calderbank	Residential Zones	Oppose	Incentivise existing residential owners to infill in a sympathetic manner on existing larger sections, by removing the development levies and additional rates charges.	Refer to reasons in submission point S388.019.	Reject	Section 12
1320	S388.035	Gary Calderbank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Streamline the RC and BC processes to allow houses to be built quicker and at a lower cost to the end user.	I do not believe that PC29 is a fair or workable solution to our current housing issues in the area. It appear developer focussed more than community focussed [through the] removal of current individual resource and planning consent processes that protect the greater community. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
1321	S388.036	Gary Calderbank	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Abandon PC29 and seek better advice on urban growth/ densification to suit the specific needs of the Nelson community.	The broad brush PC29 is not the solution and should be scrapped. [PC29] has the potential of creating environmental detriments to existing residential dwellings and lacks a transparent control mechanism to create the housing needs of the future (i.e affordable, sustainable housing vs wealthy / holiday homes). [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
1322	FS5.017	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 9
1323	S389.005	Elizabeth Dooley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Create] an overall plan for the city centre and adjoining residential areas.	Without an overall plan, the city centre and adjoining residential areas will be developed by developers who have no interest in Nelson City itself, so it is imperative that nothing is started until we have a street plan laid out.	Reject	Section 9
1324	FS78.016	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: [Create] an overall plan for the city centre and adjoining residential areas. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13
1325	FS65.200	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: [Create] an overall plan for the city centre and adjoining residential areas. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12

1326	S390.001	Thomas Currie	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the proposed high density residential zone.	I am concerned that the high density buildings will impact sunlight, privacy, garden productivity and solar panel production.	Accept	Section 12
1327	S392.004	Johanna Peter	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 S392.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
1328	S392.006	Johanna Peter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S392.001 and S392.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
1329	S392.007	Johanna Peter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
1330	S392.008	Johanna Peter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
1331	S393.004	Paul Fox	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 S393.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
1332	S393.006	Paul Fox	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S393.001 and S393.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
1333	S393.007	Paul Fox	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
1334	S393.008	Paul Fox	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
1335	S393.009	Paul Fox	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Build 2-3 storey units in areas where single storey dwellings and their owners are not affected.	This proposal is daylight theft and should not be allowed nest to or close to existing single storey structures.	Reject	Section 9
1336	S395.004	Andrew Sullivan	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 S395.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
1337	S395.006	Andrew Sullivan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S395.001 and S395.004 above. I oppose any building of 3 storeys or more outside of Nelson CBD (Trafalgar, Halifax, Collingwood, Selwyn St boundaries). Utilisation of land inside this are should be prioritised over any suburban areas.	Accept in part	Section 12
1338	S395.007	Andrew Sullivan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
1339	S395.008	Andrew Sullivan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
1340	S395.010	Andrew Sullivan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Suggest] a co-ordinated plan involving an official planning committee, made up of residents and council to plan for future growth in a co-ordinated manner.	Not leaving decisions on Nelson's future to developers or individual landowners.	Reject	Section 13
1341	FS65.202	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: [Suggest] a co-ordinated plan involving an official planning committee, made up of residents and council to plan for future growth in a co-ordinated manner [not leave to developers or individual landowners]. 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 13

1342	S396.001	Arnold Ayre	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29 in its current form.	Nelson city has been identified by many of its citizens, often after travelling to many places both in New Zealand and overseas, as offering the best environment for them to settle. It offers a special blend of city and outdoor living, is known for its arts and crafts, its access to mountains and sea, and its friendly outdoor living style. Heritage is about more than just a handful of nominated streets and buildings. It is about what makes the city as a whole special, and what is passed from previous generations to future generations; from previous city councils, to future city councils. I suggest that the proposed Plan 29 change is likely to irreparably break the link in our heritage. Put more resources and effort into analyzing the demographic of our current and future housing needs (eg lack of a Night Shelter). Maintain control of the development of our city with an ongoing case by case Resource Consent approach that reflects, preserves, and enhances the character of each individual urban environment thus ensuring Nelson's heritage is preserved. I support the council adopting a Resource Management Plan that caters for our present and future housing needs, also taking into account the likely effects climate change will have on both current and proposed housing developments. I acknowledge that intensification in some areas will be needed to meet these needs. I do not support a plan that devolves responsibility for our residential cityscape to commercial development. I do not support the division of our residential zoning into large chunks that allow, to different degrees, intensive development regardless of detrimental effect on cityscape and neighboring properties. I suggest there are opportunities for intensification without detrimental effects, such as multistory	Reject	Section 9
1343	FS78.211	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission I support are: Reject.[Heritage is about more than just a handful of nominated streets and buildings. It is about what makes the city as a whole special, and what is passed from previous generations to future generations; from previous city councils, to future city councils. I suggest that the proposed Plan 29 change is likely to irreparably break the link in Our heritage.] 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 in part	Section 12
1344	FS65.204	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: Reject. [Heritage is about more than just a handful of nominated streets and buildings. It is about what makes the city as a whole special, and what is passed from previous generations to future generations; from previous city councils, to future city councils. I suggest that the proposed Plan 29 change is likely to irreparably break the link in our heritage.] 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 in part	Section 12
1345	S397.001	Ali Lawley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S397.002.	Reject	Section 13

1346	S397.002	Ali Lawley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. NCC appears to have failed to take account of the findings of the report commissioned by NCC and TDC in 2021 called Housing We'd Chose by m.e Consulting (Document reference: TDC 002.21 HWC Tasman Nelson) which analyses housing preferences of the population. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1347	S397.003	Ali Lawley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1348	S397.004	Ali Lawley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1349	S397.006	Ali Lawley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S397.005.	Reject	Section 13
1350	S397.010	Ali Lawley	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1351	S397.011	Ali Lawley	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 12
1352	FS28.020	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 in part	Section 12
1353	S397.013	Ali Lawley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13

1354	S397.019	Ali Lawley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1355	S397.027	Ali Lawley	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.	Reject	Section 13
1356	S397.029	Ali Lawley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1357	S397.030	Ali Lawley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1358	S397.031	Ali Lawley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw [PC29], [undertake] community engagement to create a new one.	[Refer to reasons provided in this submission].	Reject	Section 9
1359	S397.034	Ali Lawley	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 of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S397.019.	Reject	Section 13
1360	S397.035	Ali Lawley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Incentivise existing residential owners to infill in a sympathetic manner on existing larger sections, by removing the development levies and additional rates charges.	Refer to reasons in submission point S397.019.	Reject	Section 10
1361	S397.036	Ali Lawley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S480.005 and S480.011.	Reject	Section 13
1362	S399.001	Wendy Drummond	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Review Plan Change 29, taking into account the submissions received and amend accordingly.	I support more affordable, sustainable housing & more choice, especially in Nelson CBD. BUT 6 stories are only acceptable where there are other tall buildings. They are not appropriate in Stoke. Nearly 50 % of the CBD is presently car parking, car yards (e.g. the new Turners) & roads.	Reject	Section 12
1363	S402.004	Russell King	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 S402.001.	Accept in part	Section 12

1364	S402.006	Russell King	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City [and multi-site developments in specified locations that meet existing bulk and location requirements], before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S402.001 and S402.004 above. There is no need to allow three and six storey developments outside the central business district with provision for multi-site developments in specified locations. There is ample land in the central city and there are pockets of land in areas of Tahunanui, Washington Valley, for example, where sites of older buildings could be amalgamated and multi-storey dwellings erected without compromising the amenities of neighbours. Such developments should meet existing bulk and location requirements and be consented.	Accept in part	Section 12
1365	FS61.093	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- here is no need to allow three and six storey developments outside the central business district with provision for multi-site developments in specified locations. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Prioritise inner city HDZ and MDZ before residential areas.	Reject	Section 12
1366	FS72.097	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- There is no need to allow three and six storey developments outside the central business district with provision for multi-site developments in specified locations. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Prioritise inner city HDZ and MDZ before residential areas.	Accept in part	Section 12
1367	FS60.089	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- here is no need to allow three and six storey developments outside the central business district with provision for multi-site developments in specified locations. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Prioritise inner city HDZ and MDZ before residential areas.	Reject	Section 12
1368	S402.007	Russell King	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
1369	S402.008	Russell King	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
1370	S402.009	Russell King	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29 and develop a new plan after submission have been considered].	Plan change 29 in concept and in detail, it should be abandoned and a new plan developed after submissions have been considered.	Reject	Section 9
1371	S403.001	Ashley Frechette	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons on submission point S403.002.	Reject	Section 13
1372	S403.002	Ashley Frechette	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1373	S403.003	Ashley Frechette	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1374	S403.004	Ashley Frechette	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10

1375	S403.006	Ashley Frechette	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S403.005.	Reject	Section 13
1376	S403.010	Ashley Frechette	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1377	S403.011	Ashley Frechette	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 12
1378	FS28.021	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 in part	Section 12
1379	S403.013	Ashley Frechette	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
1380	S403.018	Ashley Frechette	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S403.005 and S403.011.	Reject	Section 13
1381	S403.019	Ashley Frechette	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1382	S403.027	Ashley Frechette	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
1383	S403.029	Ashley Frechette	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

1384	S403.030	Ashley Frechette	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1385	S404.001	Ian Gillespie	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support Plan Change 29.	I support Plan Change 29 in all aspects because Nelson City needs revitalisation.	Accept	Section 12
1386	FS78.215	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Support Plan Change 29. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. 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. 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 Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis.	Reject	Section 12
1387	FS65.210	Heritage Nelson		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission we oppose is: Support Plan Change 29. 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 in part	Section 12
1388	S404.002	Ian Gillespie	Inner City and City Fringe Zones	Support	Support the land currently lease to the Nelson Croquet club adjacent to Halifax St to be rezoned as residential and used for high density housing.	I also support the land currently lease to the Nelson Croquet club adjacent to Halifax St to be rezoned as residential and used for high density housing. The land referred to above is used by few people on few occasions.	Reject	Section 9
1389	FS78.435	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 12
1390	S405.001	Patricia Carter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons on submission point S405.002.	Reject	Section 13
1391	S405.002	Patricia Carter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1392	S405.003	Patricia Carter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1393	S405.004	Patricia Carter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10

1394	S405.006	Patricia Carter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S405.005.	Reject	Section 13
1395	S405.010	Patricia Carter	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. Do you know many pensioners who have zero medical problems? Heart issues, knee problems, hip problems, are usual, none of which are conducive to living with stairs. Two stories or duplex buildings would seem a better solution. Have you thought of the downside of high density housing? Has anyone thought of the repercussions of fire or pandemics with intensive living conditions? Intensification, if not treated sensibly is a disaster and slum waiting to happen. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1396	S405.011	Patricia Carter	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 12
1397	FS28.022	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 in part	Section 12
1398	S405.013	Patricia Carter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
1399	S405.018	Patricia Carter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S405.005 and S405.011.	Reject	Section 13
1400	S405.019	Patricia Carter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10

1401	S405.027	Patricia Carter	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. No one is impressed by " matchstick " houses currently built by Kainga Ora. [Refer to original submission for more detail].	Reject	Section 13
1402	S405.029	Patricia Carter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1403	S405.030	Patricia Carter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1404	S405.031	Patricia Carter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Engage the help of experts such as Dr Geoffrey Hayes, William Samuels, Mark Fielding , Jan Whittaker, Dave Mountford, to name a few.	There are others with a wealth of experience and knowledge and all seem more concerned than biased.	Reject	Section 13
1405	S405.032	Patricia Carter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Support S453] the submission from Steve Webster.	I am aware of the submission from Steve Webster and totally agree. He is more concise than I am and raises more valid concerns.	Reject	Section 9
1406	S406.001	Debbie Hampson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons on submission point S406.002.	Reject	Section 13
1407	S406.002	Debbie Hampson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1408	S406.003	Debbie Hampson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1409	S406.004	Debbie Hampson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1410	S406.006	Debbie Hampson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S406.005.	Reject	Section 13
1411	S406.010	Debbie Hampson	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12

1412	S406.011	Debbie Hampson	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 12
1413	FS28.023	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 in part	Section 12
1414	S406.013	Debbie Hampson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
1415	S406.018	Debbie Hampson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S406.005 and S406.011.	Reject	Section 13
1416	S406.019	Debbie Hampson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1417	S406.027	Debbie Hampson	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
1418	S406.029	Debbie Hampson	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1419	S406.030	Debbie Hampson	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

1420	S408.001	Connie May Nisbet	Entire Plan Change	Support	Progress the objective of this plan change, and in particular, prioritise intensification ahead of greenfields development, and support avoidance of development in hazard prone areas.	I strongly support the objective of urban intensification in Nelson. I welcome the growth of Nelson and think its important that quality housing is available for our increasing population. I support the intention of intensification within Nelson rather than greenfields expansion. Greenfields development is expensive because it requires the provision of new infrastructure. It also worsens existing problems with congestion on Nelsons roads. We need to look after our food producing soils and should definitely not be using productive land for housing development. Carefully designed urban intensification has the ability to improve the character of Nelson. We have a lot of old, run down housing stock which could be replaced with better quality well designed housing. I encourage the council to support co housing options which provide social as well as environmental benefits particularly the ability to share resources. I am heartened that the plan change seems to give serious consideration to the risks posed by natural hazards and encourage the council to maintain its approach of avoiding intensification in hazards prone areas. As we have seen with the severe weather events earlier this year, and the Nelson floods last year, the social and economic costs of hazard events are high, and council (therefore ratepayers) are likely to bear a significant proportion of the costs of recovery. Its important to focus on the needs of the entire community - including our future community. If Nelson does not grow it will stagnate, and that does not benefit anyone.	Accept	Section 12
1421	S408.002	Connie May Nisbet	Mapping	Oppose in part	Change the High Density Residential zone in Tahunanui hills to Medium Density.	I encourage reconsideration of the high density zone in Tahunanui. While I support intensification in general, my view is that 6 storeys on the Tahunanui hills is impractical and unnecessary. I support the classification of the entire Tahunanui area as medium density. In my view this will provide for sufficient development potential.	Reject	Section 12
1422	FS61.071	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support in part	Accept in part	The Particular Part of the submission I support in part/:- Is to remove High density zoning from the Tahunanui hills. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support in part: - is for the removal of HDZ on the Tahunanui Hills.	Accept in part	Section 12
1423	FS72.075	Jude Osborne		Support in part	Accept in part	The Particular Part of the submission I support in part/:- Is to remove High density zoning from the Tahunanui hills. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support in part: - is for the removal of HDZ on the Tahunanui Hills.	Accept in part	Section 12
1424	FS60.067	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support in part	Accept in part	The Particular Part of the submission I support in part/:- Is to remove High density zoning from the Tahunanui hills. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support in part: - is for the removal of HDZ on the Tahunanui Hills.	Accept in part	Section 12
1425	S409.001	Mary McKinlay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	Refer to the reasons on submission point S409.002.	Reject	Section 13
1426	S409.002	Mary McKinlay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 in its entirety.	The promotion of PC29 by the Council has been misleading in that it implies that it is the only option available AND required by law. The plan is not the only option and Nelson is not required to provide for high-density housing. It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
1427	S409.003	Mary McKinlay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting. Refer to original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 13

1428	S409.004	Mary McKinlay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1429	S409.006	Mary McKinlay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S409.005.	Reject	Section 13
1430	S409.010	Mary McKinlay	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	PC29 is not in character or in keeping with the existing 'General Residential Zone'. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Accept	Section 12
1431	S409.018	Mary McKinlay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Bigger older properties, could be better utilised and help with our growth if they were more easily allowed to be divided into multi-dwellings. Refer to reasons in submission points S409.005 and S409.011.	Reject	Section 13
1432	S409.019	Mary McKinlay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe.	To accommodate the "expected" population growth the Council should take a staged approach to intensification. First, in the Inner City - Centre (North of the Cathedral) should be the starting place for the most significant intensification. Second, the Inner City - Fringe could be the next zone to phase in for intensification. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1433	S409.027	Mary McKinlay	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
1434	S409.029	Mary McKinlay	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1435	S409.030	Mary McKinlay	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1436	S409.032	Mary McKinlay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider the requirements for a Tier 2 city.	I understand the requirement for Central Government and Councils to plan for population growth and consider options for improving access to housing for people who currently struggle to access affordable homes. [However], 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).	Reject	Section 9
1437	S409.035	Mary McKinlay	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Carry out an independent "Visual Pollution Assessment" (VPA) based on the proposed new zoning under PC29.	[If] new density areas are left to developers discretion, Nelson City will become an eyesore, rather than a city with a consistent pattern of development. This will affect residential property [values] and people will [leave] the city in want of less visually polluted areas.	Reject	Section 13

1438	S410.001	Kathleen Mardon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Cancellation of the whole Plan Change 29.	Intensification to the level proposed in PC29 is not required under the NPSUD 2020 for Tier 2 Councils. It does not solve the issue of extra housing availability or affordability as high rise apartments are very expensive to build and tend to be bought up by investors.	Reject	Section 9
1439	S410.002	Kathleen Mardon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Abolish the High and Medium Density Zones and have one standard residential zone.	Intensification should be carried out incrementally, starting with the inner city and city fringe areas. High rise apartments up to 6 storeys would have serious adverse effects on existing residential properties including: loss of general amenity, sunlight, outlook; ruining the unique character and shape of the area.	Reject	Section 10
1440	S411.001	Rob Harris	Entire Plan Change	Amend	[Undertake] a more comprehensive spatial mapping exercise that identifies discrete functional neighbourhoods or localities based on a combination of physical, natural, and cultural factors.	1. To ensure a better planning process - less cookie cutter in nature and more easily directed. 2. Protect meaningful locality values and local character while still providing for necessary intensification. 3. Ensure a better process for enabling an understanding of the available potential for future growth, as well as greater predictability as to location and cost. Intensification will be essential in coming years as parts of Nelson become less usable for development and redevelopment due to factors such as increased natural hazard effect in areas like the Wood, parts of Tahunanui and fringe areas along the Maitai, and a shift in demand towards smaller households combined with an increasing population. The Plan Change is therefore partly predicated on these factors and supported by a National Policy Statement on Urban Development. As is pointed out in the explanations for the Change on the Council website the requirement for intensification will happen over time. Because of this there is a danger of the Plan Change being implemented in an ad hoc manner and also expose residents and investors in Nelson to some uncertainty as to where intensification will occur and what effect this will have on individual properties close to redevelopment. There are clearly fears that this Plan Change will lead to significant loss/transformation of Nelson's values - that is, low density living, relaxed environment, an older heritage environment, a landscape less dominated by buildings and more by its natural landscape components. Some of those fears are real, as NZ's planning system is relatively laissez faire and urban development and change can be very ad hoc and uncoordinated in terms of matching infrastructure provision and funding, setting of neighbourhood standards and local	Reject	Section 13
1441	FS65.448	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	[Undertake] a more comprehensive spatial mapping exercise that identifies discrete functional neighbourhoods or localities based on a combination of physical, natural, and cultural factors. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
1442	S411.003	Rob Harris	Mapping	Amend	Identify the 'neighbourhoods' present character and characteristics - e.g. intensity, age of buildings and potential for replacement, representative architecture, character architecture and local heritage qualities, vegetation coverage, terrain, connections such as walkways and special features.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S411.001 and the original submission for more detail.	Accept in part	Section 12
1443	FS78.017	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Identify the 'neighbourhoods' present character and characteristics - e.g. intensity, age of buildings and potential for replacement, representative architecture, character architecture and local heritage qualities, vegetation coverage, terrain, connections such as walkways and special features. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13

1444	FS65.217	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Identify the 'neighbourhoods' present character and characteristics - e.g. intensity, age of buildings and potential for replacement, representative architecture, character architecture and local heritage qualities, vegetation coverage, terrain, connections such as walkways and special features. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
1445	S411.004	Rob Harris	Residential Zones	Amend	identify sites within each functional neighbourhood or locality that are feasible for intensification due to orientation, size, proximity to transport routes, ability to contribute to mixed use (residential upper floors on commercial ground floors). Equally identify areas that can't easily or shouldn't be intensified due to heritage, cultural, infrastructural, hazard, recreational, landscape or other practical reason and map them accordingly as less desirable for intensification.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S411.001 and the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 12
1446	FS78.018	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Identify sites within each functional neighbourhood or locality that are feasible for intensification due to orientation, size, proximity to transport routes, ability to contribute to mixed use (residential upper floors on commercial ground floors). Equally identify areas that can't easily or shouldn't be intensified due to heritage, cultural, infrastructural, hazard, recreational, landscape or other practical reason and map them accordingly as less desirable for intensification. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13
1447	FS65.218	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Identify sites within each functional neighbourhood or locality that are feasible for intensification due to orientation, size, proximity to transport routes, ability to contribute to mixed use (residential upper floors on commercial ground floors). Equally identify areas that can't easily or shouldn't be intensified due to heritage, cultural, infrastructural, hazard, recreational, landscape or other practical reason and map them accordingly as less desirable for intensification. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12

1448	S412.001	Belinda Davies	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Confine the intensification to meet Nelson's current and future housing needs as covered in Chapter 5 (District wide objectives and policies) at this stage to the inner city zones.	I endorse the point made by urban designer Timo Neubauer in the Nelson Weekly (11 October '23) and Stuff (23 October '23) that intensification must happen only within a framework of comprehensive neighbourhood plans. In general I agree with his argument that "with a clear picture at hand the community will be much more at ease with the trade-offs intensification demands, and will understand the enormous benefits to come with it." In the short term at least, however, I see potential benefits only in the inner city zones. New residential zones: At this stage it's difficult to see much benefit accruing to the higher density residential zones with the proposed new standards and rules, which might to some extent protect residents' daylight - but not the sunlight so valued here. One of Nelson's great assets are its cherished trees and private as well as public gardens, from which we all benefit. For this reason alone it seems premature to consider allowing developers to make their profits by picking off individual properties to build upwards at the expense of the neighbouring houses and gardens, which need sunlight to continue to flourish. That apartment blocks should be allowed in established communities without prior consultation or even notification would, I believe, be extremely unjust and harmful to community stability and goodwill. Inner city zones: If intensification as proposed by Plan Change 29 is spread piecemeal over large parts of residential Nelson I believe an opportunity to revitalise the CBD will be compromised. Nelson needs more people living in the CBD. If this requires compulsory buying up of whole blocks of under-used commercial property for a mix of apartments and social housing, this seems less draconian than the plan to allow	Accept in part	Section 12
1449	S413.005	Scott Figenshow	Residential Zones	Amend	Clarify how Development Contributions are applied, in particular, the trigger should be whether any additional units are legally subdivided from the original title before any further development contributions are payable.	Adding a residential unit (on the existing title) should not itself trigger payment of additional development contributions, if Council's aim is to encourage intensification. Our reasoning is that the existing house is a one bathroom, two bedroom dwelling. No additional development contributions would be payable if we expanded it to be a five bedroom, four bathroom home. So why would the addition of one bedroom, one bathroom, in a separate building (sleepout / residential unit) trigger payment of further development contributions so long as no subdivision occurs? We were already required to make a connection to council stormwater, and install stormwater retention on-site. However, we would agree that if the new residential unit is subdivided and can be sold separately, then it is fair to pay development contributions, as a new title is being created. A landowner can monetise (sell) that property and thus generate cash to pay the fees. We can't do that when the unit is on our same title.	Reject	Section 12
1450	S413.006	Scott Figenshow	Residential Zones	Amend	Add separate economic incentives to improve housing affordability, such as an Inclusionary Housing programme.	PC 29 won't by itself improve housing affordability in Nelson. However a complimentary, fit-for-purpose set of economic incentives, such as value capture through an inclusionary housing programme, with units owned and operated by registered Community Housing Providers would be a robust way to achieve both intensification and improve housing affordability. [Refer to the original submission for further details.]	Reject	Section 13

1451	S415.001	Kirsten Cooper	Residential Zones	Oppose	Replace the areas indicated as High Density Residential Zone with the Medium Density Residential Zone.	I want Nelson to be able to intensify in a manner that allows the essential character of our City to remain. Within the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone guidelines, there are ample opportunities to double or triple the number of dwellings already. The zones marked out for High Density development seem excessive. I have observed and experienced medium density (3-4 story) areas in a number of large cities around the world - and this provides plenty of opportunities to condense populations while remaining a human-centred environment. There is a phrase in the PC29 - S32 Report Appendix 3A - 'gentle density' and that is, I believe, an ambition for this Council to aspire to.	Accept in part	Section 12
1452	S417.001	David Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons on submission point S417.002.	Reject	Section 13
1453	S417.002	David Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1454	S417.004	David Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1455	S417.006	David Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S417.005.	Reject	Section 13
1456	S417.010	David Smith	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1457	S417.011	David Smith	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 12
1458	FS28.025	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 in part	Section 12
1459	S417.018	David Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S417.005 and S417.011.	Reject	Section 13

1460	S417.019	David Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1461	S417.027	David Smith	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
1462	S417.029	David Smith	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1463	S417.030	David Smith	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1464	S417.037	David Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	More "push back" (not law breaking) on matters that local Nelsonian residents seek for their city.	Refer to reasons in submission point S417.027.	Reject	Section 13
1465	S418.001	Jo Tuffery	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Define change relative to neighborhoods based on consultation with the neighborhood - neighborhood plans.	The plan is too gross in nature without any assurance that it will deliver the desired outcomes. The biggest challenge to the Nelson region is providing affordable housing....so have we even defined what affordable housing is and then set parameters on achieving this Just changing the NRMP does not provide any assurance at all that this will increase the supply of affordable housing. We seem to think that changing the plan will magically achieve affordable housing. Communities and planning should define the look and feel of neighbourhoods not a profit making developer. Lets define community and neighbourhood values before we make irreversible change that is driven by profit. You talk about small increments of change happening over the region but for those living in neighbourhoods where change occurs that are affected 100% by this change. Change should start initially in the CBD....and other designated areas not so widespread. Eight, Six stories is too much change for a regional city.	Reject	Section 13
1466	FS78.019	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Define change relative to neighbourhoods based on consultation with the neighbourhood - neighbourhood plans. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13
1467	FS65.221	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: Define change relative to neighbourhoods based on consultation with the neighbourhood - neighbourhood plans. 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 13

1468	S419.004	John Karolyi	Mapping	Support in part	[Support] taller buildings [in the] centre city, but have a medium density buffer zone that can always be reviewed in a decade or two.	Centre city definitions would be boxed within the boundaries of Halifax St, Collingwood St, St Rutherford St and Nile St. The medium density zone would be defined within the boundaries of St Vincent St, Vanguard St, Anzac park, and North Esk St As we have weather events now and our general infrastructure does not cope what is the plan to ensure it copes, it is not just pipe sizes but entire facilities that have maximum capacities, sewerage, electricity, water, stormwater, pump stations, treatment facilities, roading capacities. [Refer to original submission and attachments]	Reject	Section 12
1469	S419.005	John Karolyi	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	[Support] smaller lot size.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
1470	S419.006	John Karolyi	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Support] boundary demarcations for medium and high density [zones].	Not stated.	Accept	Section 12
1471	S422.001	Barry Kingston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Include residents and ratepayers as decision makers [for new buildings that are three storeys or more in height].	I dont think Council are fully qualified to make such important changes to current housing and residential planning, by opening up uncontrolled intensive housing opportunities to developers, overloading residential parking, affecting property values, and shutting down healthy communities.	Reject	Section 9
1472	S423.001	Susan Richards	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	[Develop overarching neighbourhood plans].	Protect what exists and work with neighbourhoods on a plan that increases the value, infrastructure and amenity of existing properties.	Reject	Section 13
1473	S423.003	Susan Richards	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	[Ensure that] new residential developments harvests and utilises its own energy and water, provides as much green space on walls or roof as is lost from the land and only provides disability and cycle parking and electric recharging.	Please do not allow supply of 20th century housing and infrastructure. This is a major opportunity to push accommodation and amenities into a 21st century where we face major climate, community and ecological challenges and we have new information and technologies that will allow Nelsonians to future proof how and where they live. For example embrace landscaping, walk and cycle ways to handle the increase in traffic not more roading. Minimise impact on existing infrastructure by offering developers rebates for providing power generation, water collection, circular waste management etc both on site and connection to existing systems. Ensure that safe, landscaped gathering spaces for people are integral to the overall design of the city upgrade. This is our opportunity to not only be the most active region in the country but also to be the most vibrant, livable city where locals are self sustaining and visitors are welcomed but are not the core of our economy.	Reject	Section 13
1474	FS5.007	Warwick Rogers		Oppose	Reject	Utter fantasy and 100% unworkable.	Reject	Section 9
1475	S423.004	Susan Richards	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Require] developments to be professionally designed to be sustainable and to improve the cityscape and landscaope in parallel with NCCs plans for a sustaibable, livable and dynamic heart of the city.	Refer to reasons in submission point S423.003.	Reject	Section 13

1476	S424.001	Ros Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support high densification with 4-6 story buildings focused in and around the city and transport corridors.	I would like Council to give effect to the National Policy Statement for urban development and the Future Development Strategy, in terms of providing more housing in Nelson over the long term. High densification with contemporary 4-6 story buildings, mixed in with older buildings and green public spaces is a desirable model. Having spent time overseas, I can see how well this works in cities around the world, such as Brussels. Betts apartments building has demonstrated that well-designed, multi story buildings enhance city living. The Rutherford hotel has demonstrated that, provided there are appropriate town planning controls, pikimai Church hill does not have to be dwarfed or crowded out by modern, multi story buildings. Successive councils have made significant investments in the central city, in terms of public buildings, heritage buildings and supporting infrastructure . However demographic projections show this investment is not being matched by residential growth in the city centre. Worse still, the projected demographic mix indicates that central Nelson will be populated by predominantly older people. The city risks becoming an enclave for wealthy retirees. People of all ages should have opportunities to use the marvellous assets Council supports and funds. We are currently banishing young people and families to the suburbs because the city lacks sufficient housing both in terms of dwelling number and type of dwelling.	Accept in part	Section 13
1477	S425.001	Tony Stephens	Entire Plan Change	Support	[Support] increased density.	In general I am in support of Plan Change 29 for the following reasons: Cultural events. Bigger populations mean more, and generally better entertainment, public engagement with the arts and sciences opportunities, education choices, and job opportunities. The need to reduce Urban Sprawl. The loss of productive farmland is a waste. Additionally, sprawl means we continue to lose many outdoor resources such as; parks, reserves, tramping tracks, the night sky, and likely many others I have not thought to include. A desire to see downtown shops busy with trade, rather than sitting empty. I see shops and small businesses as a good thing, and more likely to thrive, filling niches. Nelson has a dearth of educated 18 - 35 year olds. Young people are more likely to be attracted to affordable housing and the enriched cultural environment density is likely to provide. Communities are strengthened by a mix of ages.	Accept in part	Section 12
1478	S425.002	Tony Stephens	Entire Plan Change	Support	[Support] design esthetics and quality controls.	Refer to reasons in submission point S425.012.	Accept in part	Section 9
1479	S425.003	Tony Stephens	Entire Plan Change	Support	Encourage low carbon building.	50% of landfills is demolition and construction waste. This should be eliminated by the following means: At the point of demolition reduction. Materials can be recycled for community and schools use. Building waste reduction by using the greenest materials and practices available, even if it means higher costs. Green building can achieve Green and Home star ratings which are expected to be required of the industry in the future. This will ultimately reduce costs for NCC and ratepayers.	Reject	Section 11
1480	S425.005	Tony Stephens	Entire Plan Change	Support	[Provide] incentives for builders and developers to build up, rather than out.	To encourage success builders need incentives to build up, as it is my understanding it is less expensive to maintain the status quo of one story building on undeveloped land.	Accept in part	Section 9
1481	S425.007	Tony Stephens	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Implement] a staged approach to higher density.	There is no reason the plan change needs to be an all at once decision and implementation. PC29 will have a greater chance of success if it happens in proven stages. My proposal would be too start with the CBD, and encourage density in the form of the increased building heights. As time proves successful results, continue expansion of density to adjacent and perhaps wholly separate areas. If any parts of this growth are not successful, rethink and adjust as necessary.	Reject	Section 10

1482	S425.008	Tony Stephens	Entire Plan Change	Support	[Increase the number of parks in conjunction] with increased density.	A best outcome is likely to be achieved if open space is included. Some large parks, and lots of pocket parks. Successful cities, have open spaces. Children and adults alike need room to breathe. Mental health should be a part of the equation in making the decision to intensify more people in a smaller footprint.	Accept in part	Section 12
1483	S425.009	Tony Stephens	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Protect] existing solar power generation [facilities]. [Ensure that] no financial loss, including future losses, to properties, business or private, with existing photovoltaic or hot water heating solar systems [are incurred].	Removing access to daylight, especially in mid-winter, is bad enough. However, removing incentives to improving our carbon footprint, are not only an additionally poor outcome, but also have legal ramifications for taking away the monetary gain that these infrastructures create. Home owners and businesses have made an investment, and will need compensation for any losses that shading may create. These are losses that will extend several decades into the future if not longer. Either compensation for lost revenue in the form of dollars should be required, or perhaps a 'like for like' solution between the involved parties can be achieved. That is, that an equivalent system is provided. Though still at the developers expense, giving they are the party removing the financial asset. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
1484	S425.012	Tony Stephens	Entire Plan Change	Support	Review and enforce design standards in order to avoid generic apartment blocks.	Ugly is ugly, even if that is the lower cost method of design. Esthetic appeal makes for a better and more comfortable community.	Reject	Section 13
1485	S425.013	Tony Stephens	Entire Plan Change	Support	Build communities and safer homes by encouraging a mix of incomes.	My concern is that any dwelling deemed low income / affordable housing, is doomed to fail. Everyone, low income people included, want a safe home. If multiple occupancy dwellings are built, make them a mix of affordability, rather than all affluent or all Kainga Ora occupation. PC29 outcomes that lead to safe neighborhoods will be more likely to succeed if dividing into one or the other are avoided at the outset. Poor neighbors do not have to be bad neighbors. If blocks are built with only low income earners in mind, there is a greater chance those flats will fail to be safe homes for anyone. Nobody wants to live in, or nearby a neighborhood that feels unsafe. We should be building communities, not just homes. Safer communities will also be achieved by avoiding walled communities like that of Sussex Mews that only look inward. Instead we need eyes on the street, which encourages neighbors look out for each other. If safety is of concern, simply put dwellings on the second story and above. Shops, storage spaces and parking can easily fill ground floor spaces.	Reject	Section 13
1486	S426.001	L Knight	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the objectives of Plan Change 29.	I support the objectives of the proposed plan change - to allow for intensification and papakainga, and avoid building in inappropriate areas (in particular, avoiding natural hazards, primarily sea level rise and hillside erosion/landslides).	Accept	Section 9
1487	S426.002	L Knight	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Change the height limit [and location] of the [proposed high density residential zone].	It appears that no thought has gone into mapping the HDR zone - just a blanket approach to lines drawn on a map. 6 story buildings popping up randomly among the mainly 1 story houses south of Nile St would have serious negative effects on their neighbours - in particular, loss of sunlight and privacy, and increased noise. In contrast, as an example of where a planning process was taken to consider height and density, the development at 64-66 Nile St was limited to 2 stories on the west side and 3 stories on the east side in 2022. It would be ridiculous for the Council to now apply a blanket 6 story allowance on that site, with no consideration for the effects on the (many) neighbouring homes.	Reject	Section 12

1488	S426.003	L Knight	Mapping	Oppose in part	Limit tall buildings to the CBD, north side of Nile Street, major corridors (e.g. Rutherford Street) and against hillsides where there are no homes behind them.	Intensification is desirable - in the right places. Those include the CBD and major corridors, such as Rutherford St and Wakefield Quay/Rocks Rd. Larger and taller developments there would have fewer negative effects on neighbours. They are also the areas with the infrastructure and transport to serve development.	Accept in part	Section 12
1489	S427.001	Silvano Lorandi	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support [Plan Change 29].	General support.	Accept	Section 9
1490	S428.001	Stephen Mullins	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] that the analysis of past and projected future population growth in Nelson be peer reviewed by 2 experts in this field.	The analysis of past and projected future population growth in Nelson undertaken by the Nelson City Council (NCC) appears flawed, thus undermining the primary rationale for Plan Change 29. The details of this matter are included in the submission presented by Geoffrey Robert HAYES (Dr).	Reject	Section 10
1491	S428.002	Stephen Mullins	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] that the Panel does not include elected members and has specialists in housing design and social/ environmental impact.	I am concerned with both the size and makeup of the appointed hearings panel. I do not think the panel should have elected members on it as it introduces the potential for bias at the beginning of the process (1 member has already stated their opinion on the proposal) and at the end of the process when all councilors vote on the panel recommendations. The Christchurch City Council is currently processing a similar Plan Change for urban intensification. It has appointed an Independent Hearings Panel of five members, none of whom are elected councillors. I would anticipate the panel would include up to 5 people. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1492	S428.005	Stephen Mullins	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Request] that Council appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA), as per the Nelson Tasman 2050 proposal, to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Residential Neighbourhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy with new developments thoughtfully designed and planned to fit into exisitng neighbourhoods to maintain the essence of their character. Green Spaces, Trees and Landscaping are essential for the look and feel of some of our older neighbourhoods. They help considerably with the wellbeing of the residents and help to provide an essential part of the attraction of Nelson, which must all be considered during developing the growth of Nelson.	Reject	Section 13
1493	S428.007	Stephen Mullins	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Ask Council to incentivise rate paying residents to demolish/ reconfigure or relocate their house to create more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 10
1494	S428.009	Stephen Mullins	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Ask that intensification begin in the Inner City (to have the most significant intensification), before moving onto residential neighbourhoods.	Progressively Phased Intensification. This can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods.	Reject	Section 10
1495	S428.012	Stephen Mullins	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Support Medium Density Residential Zones to have up to 2 storey dwellings and progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, providing AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Refer to reasons in submission point S428.011.	Accept in part	Section 12

1496	S429.001	Tahunanui Business Citizen Association	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan 29 in its entirety until the public know the findings of the National Policy Statement on Climate, with respect to inundation and sea level rise, as well as the findings of Plan Change 30, regarding Nelson Airport, Extension to the north, and its impact on Tahunanui residents and businesses.	We oppose the proposed high density in residential areas where there are increased natural hazards - flooding - inundation - land instability - making it a poor choice. Priority needs to be given to all higher density zones being only applied on flat, stable land within walking, cycling and public transport means to the inner city.The inner city hub should be the focus of initial and most significant intensification before moving into residential neighbourhoods. This will allow for time for proper engagement with communities. Regarding future development in Tahunanui, there is a disconnect between proposed densification in Tahunanui Hills around Tamaki Street and its distance from the beachside community of Tahunanui, as well as lacking amenities and public transportation. This effectively creates an isolated commuter suburb, with no nearby supermarkets, bus stops or cycle lanes, and segregated from the flat beachside village of Tahunanui, its school and kindergarten. There are difficulties accessing Tamaki Street in all modes of transport. There is only one pedestrian zebra street crossing by Tahunanui School, meaning a distinct lack of infrastructure to support densification. The junction of Toswill Road and Tahunanui Drive is the site of many serious accidents including two fatalities - involving cars, cyclists and pedestrians. Heritage - Tahunanui is in the presence of many Taonga, including at the base of Bisley Avenue, at the car yard and pharmacy site as well as the Basin Reserve on Rocks Road. These are areas of significant cultural heritage and need to be treated with respect and reverence. We are also concerned with the impartiality of the hearing commissioners.	Reject	Section 9
1497	FS78.228	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Reject in entirety (until various extra information is known) [Heritage - Tahunanui is in the presence of many Taonga, including at the base of Bisley Avenue, at the car yard and pharmacy site as Ill as the Basin Reserve on Rocks Road. These are areas of significant cultural heritage and need to be treated with respect and reverence.] 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 12
1498	FS65.230	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Reject in entirety (until various extra information is known) [Heritage - Tahunanui is in the presence of many Taonga, including at the base of Bisley Avenue, at the car yard and pharmacy site as well as the Basin Reserve on Rocks Road. These are areas of significant cultural heritage and need to be treated with respect and reverence.] 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 in part	Section 12

1499	FS60.026	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- We oppose the proposed high density in residential areas where there are increased natural hazards - flooding - inundation - land instability - making it a poor choice. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support Regarding future development in Tahunanui, there is a disconnect between proposed densification in Tahunanui Hills around Tamaki Street and its distance from the beachside community of Tahunanui, as well as lacking amenities and public transportation. This effectively creates an isolated commuter suburb, with no nearby supermarkets, bus stops or cycle lanes, and segregated from the flat beachside village of Tahunanui, its school and kindergarten.	Accept in part	Section 12
1500	S429.003	Tahunanui Business Citizen Association	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Other than the direct inner city, buildings do not need to be over 4 stories and in residential areas no more than 3.	Refer to reasons in submission point S429.001.	Reject	Section 12
1501	S429.004	Tahunanui Business Citizen Association	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Provide each community the opportunity to be given an overview or plan for their community, a collaborative approach between Council and Community to influence the Shaping of their Nelson.	An example of this is the ratified Tahunanui Structure Plan (2004) which we have repeatedly asked for an opportunity to update. We envision these plans helping to obtain community buy-in and concensus.	Reject	Section 10
1502	FS78.020	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Community Plan. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13
1503	FS65.231	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Community Plan. 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 13
1504	S429.005	Tahunanui Business Citizen Association	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Focus the initial and most significant intensification in the inner city hub before moving into residential neighbourhoods.	This will allow for time for proper engagement with communities. Refer also to reasons in submission point S429.001.	Reject	Section 10
1505	S430.001	Valerie Steel	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Start intensification within the inner city, in a square bounded by Selwyn Place, Rutherford, Halifax and Collingwood Streets.	Nelson's central shopping area is dying. Empty shops and vacant spaces where buildings have been pulled down, make for a very run-down atmosphere. Within the city centre encourage more residential additions above existing shops and allow the development of high-rise mixed commercial, offices and apartments in the gaps.	Reject	Section 10
1506	S430.002	Valerie Steel	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Amend the Plan Change 29 maps to define all residential areas as the revised General Residential Zone.	This would allow the same 3X2 extensions to be gradually inserted throughout residential neighbourhoods without the negative Impacts threatened by the current plan. It will maintain the special spirit of the city, allowing it to grow in a more natural fashion and retain sunlight for all.	Reject	Section 12
1507	FS28.026	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 in part	Section 12

1508	S430.003	Valerie Steel	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Amend the process to ensure that the Commissioners are neutral or balanced.	Amend the process to ensure that the Commissioners are neutral or balanced at least and have the capability to deal with the complexity of the role. This can most easily be achieved by replacing the current named councilors. I don't believe the 3-person Commission as proposed is a fair and unbiased group. The Deputy Mayor is an ardent supporter and Ms Brand, as someone who In her election spiel. praised Nelson for its "platitude of walks", would appear to be ill-equipped for the role. The Chair was chosen on the basis of connections to the Mayor.	Reject	Section 13
1509	S430.006	Valerie Steel	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose Plan Change 29.	I am a retired secondary school teacher who lives in a 130+ yearold cottage in Brook Street Nelson. I also own a house in Stepneyville which my son lives in. My daughter who has a mild intellectual disability has lived for 10 years in her own home in King Street, Nelson. As these addresses respectively are in MDR, GR and HDR Zones, they would be impacted in different ways by the proposals of Plan Change 29. I am particularly concerned about the designation of King Street as a High Density Zone. No planner visited King Street and thought that this would be a suitable place for a six-storey development! It is a single-lane blind street with 12 properties, all but one singlestoreyed. Most are owneroccupied and with Council valuations of around $1M. There is a strong sense of community in this little neighbourhood and they sometimes congregate at the end of the street for a shared meal outside (as when they had a King St celebration on Charles' coronation day). The use of photographs to illustrate the proposed development options is misleading in that they show streetscapes where adjacent buildings are all the same height (and NOT 6 storeys) whereas what is proposed (and illustrated elsewhere in sketches) is the possibility of inserting 6-storeys beside existing single-storey homes. Significantly, this Plan is justified as a response to the previous government's response to amend the RMA. Nelson is categorised as a Tier 2 city and there is no expectation that these cities would impose 6 storeys in their response.	Accept in part	Section 12
1510	S431.002	Bruce Mutton	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Support increasing plan change submission periods from 5 weeks to 11 weeks, as occurred on this occasion.	Five weeks is insufficient time to become aware of a plan change, research, discuss, contemplate, develop opinions and find time in an averagely busy schedule to prepare a submission.	Reject	Section 13
1511	S431.003	Bruce Mutton	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Support intensification near commercial centres (Nelson, Stoke, Richmond).	In order to minimise greenfield development to the northeast and southwest of Nelson. Minimise urbanisation of horticultural and agricultural (potentially) productive land. Reduce reliance on vehicles for urban travel.	Accept in part	Section 12
1512	S432.001	Tracy Rowberry	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose the plan Change in its entirety.	I do not believe there has been sufficient or clear information on the effects of the proposed changes. I do not believe proper public consultation as recommended in the FDS has been undertaken. No evidence has been provided to determine what sort of housing or how much is required. Nelson was determined at Tier 2 but the changes seem to be directed at fast tracking the city to Tier 1. There has been no information given to us in respect of the number of houses that will become available as the Retirement complexes are occupied. This should free up a lot of houses. Providing more housing in Nelson will not provide affordable housing.	Reject	Section 9
1513	S432.004	Tracy Rowberry	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Firstly try the potential for better infill at one storey.	Nelson people do not want or need 6 story buildings. We don't need Kainga Ora determining who lives in our city and we don't need several 6 story buildings to house our own.	Reject	Section 12

1514	S436.002	Brent Doherty	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Rezone] the area bound by Tosswill Road and Tamaki Street from High Density to General Residential Zone.	The creation of a High Density or even Medium Density Zone on the Tahunanui Hill area where Nelson Council Lim information has stamped "Land not suitable for future development of subdivision" is totally contrary to this Plan Change 29. Areas of this land already have Slope Hazard Instability Overlay. The Hill has already been subject to two substantial land slips. Surely this must be sufficient warning regarding the instability of this land. There is clear evidence that many houses built on the Tahunanui Hills have been built in unsafe locations. This will again be an issue if high rise or multi rise buildings are built on these hills. The existing sewerage and rain water systems are unable to cope now. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1515	FS61.044	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The creation of a High Density or even Medium Density Zone on the Tahunanui Hill area where Nelson Council Lim information has stamped "Land not suitable for future development of subdivision" is totally contrary to this Plan Change 29. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support - Unsuitability of land as previous submissions.	Accept in part	Section 12
1516	FS72.048	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The creation of a High Density or even Medium Density Zone on the Tahunanui Hill area where Nelson Council Lim information has stamped "Land not suitable for future development of subdivision" is totally contrary to this Plan Change 29. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support - Unsuitability of land as previous submissions.	Accept in part	Section 12
1517	FS60.040	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The creation of a High Density or even Medium Density Zone on the Tahunanui Hill area where Nelson Council Lim information has stamped "Land not suitable for future development of subdivision" is totally contrary to this Plan Change 29. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support - Unsuitability of land as previous submissions.	Accept in part	Section 12
1518	S436.003	Brent Doherty	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification in the Inner City before any residential zones.	If the true reason behind Plan Change 29 is to provide housing for the needy then that housing should be located in areas where services are located. There are no supermarkets in Tahunanui, the only medical service is running at capacity and the passenger transport system is inadequate to support this growth. The Primary School is located on the opposite side of a State Highway. 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. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
1519	FS61.037	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		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.	Accept in part	Section 12
1520	FS60.028	Tahunanui Community Hub		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.	Accept in part	Section 12

1521	S436.005	Brent Doherty	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose] Plan Change 29 in all its forms.	I am against Plan Change 29 in all its forms. I acknowledge that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 9
1522	S437.001	Richarrd Hite	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Request consideration] on the soundness of the overall direction of the plan. [Propose] a review of the long term vision for our city. (What is Nelson's long term/sustainable plan to attract the tourist dollar)?	Town planning a very complicated process that requires lots of research and long-term structure to make it work. It is also a balancing act that requires the correct mix between tourism and local foot traffic. My wife and I have been fortunate enough to live in many different cities, and see the good and the bad effects of town planning. 35 years ago, in Queensland, I saw a good example of town planning going wrong and the downside effects of it, along with the money that was needed to be spent to get it right. Now 35 years later, that council has a good balance and I think lessons can be learnt for Nelson City. Nelson is in a unique position where is has many beautiful features that attract tourists, and I feel that these features should be capitalized on with town planning in mind. [Refer to original submission for more detail.]	Reject	Section 9
1523	S438.001	Geoff Butterworth	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Amend the plan to a less intensive option.	My concerns relates to high rise housing for Inner Nelson allowing up to six storeys and19.5 metres high apartments. This is very intensive proposal and looks to massively exceed the modest population growth expected. Negative impact from this are, severe shading on existing homes, devaluing lower homes visa shading and loss of amenity. Potentially changing sunny Nelson to Shady Nelson and becoming a less desirable place to live. People are attracted to Inner Nelson as it is an attractive place to live. This type of development does not assist the argument for affordable housing as the prices will be well above the average price for a home Nelson currently around $770,000. Residential rental developments such as that for KO rental properties provide another dilemma. The worse case scenario is cheap basic accommodation and little car parking, aka cheap and nasty and effectively doesn't meet the needs of the rental occupants or the surrounding community. There is significant scope going forward to develop the CBD with a much greater residential influence. The CBD seems larger than what is required, especially with destinations retailers based along Vanguard Street or Tahunanui/Stoke (aka MITRE Mega and new Countdown etc.) plus the NCC own large carparks in the CBD which would be suited higher rise development, with parking, retail and apartments. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
1524	S440.001	Kevin Gardener	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Stop Plan Change 29]	The manner in which it has been presented to residents is abysmal! To halt progress of this Entire Plan change without diligent and correct consultation with all residents of Nelson in the correct manner it should have been!	Reject	Section 13

1525	S441.001	Kelly Saunders	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Remove the] High Density Residential [Zone from Plan Change 29].	The extent of six storey buildings on existing small residential sites is out of proportion and will destroy any neighborhood amenity. The backdrop to Nelson Central is a well vegetated neighbourhood which will be destroyed with the proposed High Density. NPSUD specifies Nelson is Tier 2 Local Authority but Council are trying to impose a Tier 1 urban environment. Tier 1 is for the large cities, where the CBD is larger in area and height, not provincial towns. The loss of daylight and outlook will be extreme for properties immediately surrounding six storey buildings. In addition to the adjoining properties this effect will also be an issue for properties further afield. The CBD is the more appropriate area for High Density with mixed use. There is a risk of poor design with all zones, of which there are examples already around the city. Design becomes even more apparent with the proposed intensification reducing setbacks and increasing daylight angle limits. The residential controls proposed seem very vague with little examples of what the objectives will look like along the street frontage. Where is the Implementation Plan for the FDS, this should be issued before the plan change.	Accept	Section 12
1526	S442.001	Vernon Mardon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1527	S442.002	Vernon Mardon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S442.001.	Reject	Section 13
1528	S442.003	Vernon Mardon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote; and appoint a further two independent members to the Hearing Council.	I strongly disagree with the make-up of the Hearing Council because the two councillors who have been elected could be considered biased, following the vote on Councillor Mel Courtney's proposal to withdraw PC29 at Nelson City Council meeting of 14 September 2023. In addition, I disagree there should be only three members of the hearing panel.	Reject	Section 13
1529	S442.005	Vernon Mardon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1530	S442.007	Vernon Mardon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S442.006.	Reject	Section 13
1531	S442.012	Vernon Mardon	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely, and incorporate it into the Standard Residential Zone as proposed.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb.	Accept	Section 12

1532	S442.014	Vernon Mardon	Mapping	Oppose	Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district; 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.	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 12
1533	FS28.115	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district; 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 in part	Section 12
1534	S442.015	Vernon Mardon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
1535	S442.020	Vernon Mardon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S442.006 and S442.014.	Reject	Section 13
1536	S442.021	Vernon Mardon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1537	S442.029	Vernon Mardon	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
1538	S442.031	Vernon Mardon	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1539	S442.032	Vernon Mardon	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

1540	S443.001	Belinda Reburn	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] that the present Plan Change 29 be rejected until after a full consultation with residents, iwi, affected parties including meetings with each suburb area, and that a new Plan Change 29 proposal document be developed to reflect the consultation and acknowledging the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 requirements.	I reject Plan Change 29 and wish to be consulted on all aspects of this now and in the future. We understand that this is the biggest plan change proposal the council has ever undertaken. It is more important than ever that the approach to this is carefully managed. The Plan Change, once enacted, in whichever form or guise, will have a dramatic effect on our city and one that we will not be able to retrench from. It is my hope that the concerns and alternative solutions outlined in this submission will be considered going forward. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12
1541	FS39.014	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 9
1542	FS78.003	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
1543	S443.007	Belinda Reburn	Residential Zones	Support in part	Request: That as part of the development of Plan Change 29 we undertake an assessment of our Nelson housing stock, identifying real areas for development and prioritising these.	There are areas around Nelson Intermediate School and Victory, areas of Washington Valley and areas of Stoke where poor quality housing is in abundance. There are also areas of Nelson that might be considered for future housing including the hills to the south of Stanley Crescent. Rather than leaving the quality of future 11.0m high housing developments to chance, by Developers, there should be 'Rules' provided. Our future communities warrant the equivalent of an Urban Design Panel, to give developments or groups of developments a quality of design, providing a strong community feel, with opportunities for shared productive and amenity gardens and sharing of facilities. There appears to be some belief that the Building Code will provide us with quality housing stock. It is true that the Building Code and Building Consent compliance will bring about housing stock but there is a whole element of chance that we are leaving to Developers. Auckland has already seen this with apartment buildings being left partially complete. Wellington has a swathe of apartments that are poorly built and poorly designed. Nelson needs to lead the way with the continuation of the Urban Design Group, attached to Nelson City Council, providing effective guidance on design, complementing the Building Code and enabling us to have housing stock and housing that is well designed for the future. [Refer to original submission for more detail.]	Reject	Section 10
1544	FS39.018	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 9
1545	FS78.473	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
1546	S444.001	Penny Molnar	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	[Provide for] intensive housing especially in the inner suburbs and central city.	To ensure there are greater numbers of people living in central city for it to become lively, vibrant, safer and less reliant on cars.	Accept	Section 12
1547	S444.002	Penny Molnar	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	[Utilise] existing [vacant] brownfield areas for development.	Utilising existing spaces so that the city doesn't need to spread out into green fields as population grows.	Reject	Section 13

1548	S445.001	Paul Dukes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29 in its entirety.	According to growth statistics for Nelson City/Stoke the population will not increase to a level requiring the blanket level of intensification outlined on PC29. [Insufficient] infrastructure - roads, water, sewage, electricity, parking (to name a few). This change was poorly advertised and communicated given its significance to the local community and the environment and amenity that most current residents, in the proposed higher intensity areas, currently live. We have chosen to live in neighbourhoods that we find attractive, sunny and with local communities that are supportive and inclusive. The loss of enjoyment of living in these areas is hard to quantify but there would undoubtedly be significant effect on the local living environment if 3-6 storey buildings were erected next to single level houses, particularly on the north facing side. PC29 should be rejected as it stands, go back to planning to rejig the plan based on the numerous submissions and discussion at the very well attended public meetings, and be re-presented to the local community as a discussion paper for comment, prior to any council votes. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1549	S445.002	Paul Dukes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Restrict] intensification to the [Inner City and City Fringe] zones.	3 and 6 storey development should be reserved for the City Centre and adjacent mixed use areas. It would be much more acceptable to consider low rise intensification in suburban residential areas.	Accept in part	Section 12
1550	S445.004	Paul Dukes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Consider extending the hearings panel] to 5-7 members, most of them independent.	The panel which will be reviewing the submissions and making recommendations to the council is 3 people, 2 of whom are councillors and have already voted in favour of PC29. One independent reviewer only. This seems inappropriately biased and calls into question the integrity of the review system.	Reject	Section 13
1551	S448.001	Anne and Andrew Weir	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Have someone with basic computer skills test drive [the submission] forms in the future.	It is complicated enough to prepare a submission without having to fight the submission form.	Reject	Section 9
1552	S448.003	Anne and Andrew Weir	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Long term residential growth plans should be modelled on medium growth projections provided and published by Stats NZ or a similar independent organisation.	The population projections should not be based on extreme or very high growth. The growth plans should reflect independent population projections and not be based on projections made by Nelson City Council staff, or made specifically for Nelson City Council.	Reject	Section 10
1553	S448.004	Anne and Andrew Weir	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Prioritise] infill housing and small low-rise developments in General Residential Zones over building upwards.	Not stated.	Accept in part	Section 12
1554	S448.005	Anne and Andrew Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Develop] spatial neighbourhood plans for proposed Medium and High Density Zones before zone changes are approved and enforced.	This would give some certainty on green space, play areas, access, outlook and light as well as the form and location of future buildings.	Reject	Section 13
1555	S448.006	Anne and Andrew Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Develop] spatial neighbourhood plans for proposed Medium and High Density Zones before zone changes are approved and enforced.	This would give some certainty on green space, play areas, access, outlook and light as well as the form and location of future buildings.	Reject	Section 13
1556	S448.007	Anne and Andrew Weir	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Progressively develop and implement neighbourhood plans and intensification zones.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
1557	FS78.021	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Develop neighbourhood plans. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13
1558	FS78.235	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Develop neighbourhood plans. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13

1559	FS65.239	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: Develop neighbourhood plans. 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 13
1560	S448.010	Anne and Andrew Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Apply] the General Residential Zoning to the Tahunanui and Tosswill Road area. It should not be re-zoned to High or Medium Density.	The Tahunanui commercial area is not a full shopping centre and the area above SH6 does not have good public transport available.	Accept	Section 12
1561	FS61.045	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The Tahunanui commercial area is not a full shopping centre and the area above SH6 does not have good public transport available. Residents need to use private vehicles to access most services and most streets in the proposed intensification zone are not suited to on-road parking. The residential area is on a steep hillside and residents with mobility issues or with young children need their own transport. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support - No public transport anywhere near the planned HDZ in Tahunanui. Require properties in [the Tahunanui and Tosswill Road area] to have off-street parking.	Accept in part	Section 12
1562	FS72.049	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The Tahunanui commercial area is not a full shopping centre and the area above SH6 does not have good public transport available. Residents need to use private vehicles to access most services and most streets in the proposed intensification zone are not suited to on-road parking. The residential area is on a steep hillside and residents with mobility issues or with young children need their own transport. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support - No public transport anywhere near the planned HDZ in Tahunanui. Require properties in [the Tahunanui and Tosswill Road area] to have off-street parking.	Accept in part	Section 12
1563	FS60.041	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The Tahunanui commercial area is not a full shopping centre and the area above SH6 does not have good public transport available. Residents need to use private vehicles to access most services and most streets in the proposed intensification zone are not suited to on-road parking. The residential area is on a steep hillside and residents with mobility issues or with young children need their own transport. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support - No public transport anywhere near the planned HDZ in Tahunanui. Require properties in [the Tahunanui and Tosswill Road area] to have off-street parking.	Accept in part	Section 12
1564	S448.011	Anne and Andrew Weir	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Apply] the General Residential Zoning to the Tahunanui and Tosswill Road area. It should not be re-zoned to High or Medium Density.	The Tahunanui commercial area is not a full shopping centre and the area above SH6 does not have good public transport available.	Accept	Section 12
1565	FS61.046	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The Tahunanui commercial area is not a full shopping centre and the area above SH6 does not have good public transport available. Residents need to use private vehicles to access most services and most streets in the proposed intensification zone are not suited to on-road parking. The residential area is on a steep hillside and residents with mobility issues or with young children need their own transport. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support - No public transport anywhere near the planned HDZ in Tahunanui. Require properties in [the Tahunanui and Tosswill Road area] to have off-street parking.	Accept in part	Section 12

1566	FS72.050	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The Tahunanui commercial area is not a full shopping centre and the area above SH6 does not have good public transport available. Residents need to use private vehicles to access most services and most streets in the proposed intensification zone are not suited to on-road parking. The residential area is on a steep hillside and residents with mobility issues or with young children need their own transport. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support - No public transport anywhere near the planned HDZ in Tahunanui. Require properties in [the Tahunanui and Tosswill Road area] to have off-street parking.	Accept in part	Section 12
1567	FS60.042	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The Tahunanui commercial area is not a full shopping centre and the area above SH6 does not have good public transport available. Residents need to use private vehicles to access most services and most streets in the proposed intensification zone are not suited to on-road parking. The residential area is on a steep hillside and residents with mobility issues or with young children need their own transport. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support - No public transport anywhere near the planned HDZ in Tahunanui. Require properties in [the Tahunanui and Tosswill Road area] to have off-street parking.	Accept in part	Section 12
1568	S448.014	Anne and Andrew Weir	Residential Zones	Amend	[Revisit the zoning of the flat land in Tahunanui for suitability for low-rise development and infill housing].	The existing Residential Standard Area on the flat land in Tahunanui has not been included in the re-zoning and intensification plans. This decision should be revisited. Engineering advice on suitable foundations and building construction could mean that low-rise developments and infill housing could be developed in this area with no greater hazard risk than, for example, the inner city zone or the Tosswill Road hillside zone.	Reject	Section 13
1569	FS28.130	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Revisit the zoning of the flat land in Tahunanui for suitability for low-rise development and infill housing. 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 specific 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
1570	S449.001	Eva Currie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29.	I reject the whole of Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 in view of the extreme loss of amenity, sunlight, privacy and views. Because of the importance of sun and privacy for our living requirements we research the regulation of neighbouring properties heights affecting daylight angles, given the rules supported status quo of neighbouring property heights we purchased [our current home]. I am a keen gardener and with current sunlight levels I am able to grow winter greens, we have a productive lemon and feijoa trees, all this would change with a new build at the proposed height restrictions at our boundary. We have been gradually future proofing our home and had planned to install solar panels, if plan change 29 is enacted there is no point continuing with planned improvements with solar panels as we would have no guarantee that the panels wouldn't be shaded by development on neighbouring properties. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9

1571	S450.001	Bernard Brewster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC 29 in its entirety.	The Plan Change 29 process has been poorly thought-through by Council and poorly communicated prior to the subsequent public meetings. At the meetings I attended planning staff were vague in their answers, and did not volunteer important information unless specifically asked for it. Refer also to reasons in subsequent submission points.	Reject	Section 13
1572	S450.002	Bernard Brewster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Nelson's intensification requirements should be adjusted according to the Statistics NZ medium projections were recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1.	NCC's population forecasts are not Statistics NZ medium projects, but are inflated projections. Statistics NZ medium projections were recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1. Nelson is only a tier 2 city and there is no mandate requirement for the degree of intensification proposed.	Reject	Section 10
1573	S450.007	Bernard Brewster	Mapping	Oppose	Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire city, on the basis that sunlight protection rules apply to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S450.006.	Reject	Section 12
1574	FS28.116	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire city, on the basis that sunlight protection rules apply to all preexisting 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 in part	Section 12
1575	S450.008	Bernard Brewster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Prioritise intensification in the inner city before residential neighbourhoods].	The inner city is the obvious starting point for intensification, before forcing this needlessly on residential neighbourhoods. This would also give more time to develop a better design vision for city neighbourhoods.	Reject	Section 10
1576	S450.012	Bernard Brewster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments].	Holiday apartments sitting empty for long periods do not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemmas - e.g. Rocks Rd and Haven Rd have many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
1577	S451.004	Lewis Thompson	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 S451.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
1578	S451.006	Lewis Thompson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S451.001 and S451.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
1579	S451.007	Lewis Thompson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
1580	S451.011	Lewis Thompson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Encourage development of hillside subdivisions on sunny faces where houses look over their neighbours and get plenty of sunshine.	Not stated.	Reject in part	Section 12
1581	S451.012	Lewis Thompson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Suggest] Intensification with multi-storey buildings should be limited to those sites that don't block or shade those behind them.	Intensification with multi-storey buildings should be limited to those sites that don't block or shade those behind them, for example, in front of a steep bank such as around Haven Road, part of Wakefield Quay, Rocks Road, the road up to Walker Bluff on hillside. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12

1582	S452.001	Claire McKenzie	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	General support for the Plan Change, subject to the amendments set out in the submission.	I generally support the Plan Change as there are many compelling reasons why we need to encourage intensification of development: To reduce urban sprawl onto productive farmland To reduce infrastructure costs To reduce reliance on private cars to access services Reduce transport costs Improve the vibrancy and safety from having people living in the city centre Increase the number of people who can easily walk, or use other forms of active transport, to access key services and activities. I believe urban intensification is the right thing to do, even if the NPS-UD were to be 'weakened' in the future. This is about planning for the future, which needs to look quite different from the past in many ways. I don't think that you need to 'stop' plan change 29, but there are aspects that could be amended and/or clarified or paused.	Accept in part	Section 12
1583	S452.002	Claire McKenzie	Entire Plan Change	Amend	[Restrict high density of up to 6 storeys to the inner city core and city fringe].	The proposed high density zones of up to 6 storeys would be best suited to the inner city core and city fringe. They would be out of character for Nelson if extended much further than that.	Reject in part	Section 12
1584	S452.008	Claire McKenzie	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	[Develop] design guidelines to accompany [PC 29].	I think it would be important to have some design guidelines to accompany the new proposal. Those developing private sites, tend to do what they want to do with the site and this isn't always in keeping with the overall context or goals for the city, or with thought to the immediate surrounding area. Some design guidelines will help to achieve the broad goals and provide amenity that is needed.	Accept	Section 13
1585	S452.009	Claire McKenzie	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	[Develop and consult on] spatial neighbourhood plans.	There would be value is doing the spatial neighbourhood plans that have been discussed and consulting during their preparation.	Reject	Section 13
1586	FS78.022	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Develop neighbourhood plans. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13
1587	FS65.242	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: Develop neighbourhood plans. 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 13
1588	S453.001	Stephen Webster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons on submission point S453.002.	Reject	Section 13
1589	FS83.056	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1590	FS77.022	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 13
1591	S453.002	Stephen Webster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1592	FS83.057	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12

1593	FS77.023	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 13
1594	S453.003	Stephen Webster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1595	FS83.058	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1596	FS77.024	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 13
1597	S453.004	Stephen Webster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1598	FS83.059	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1599	FS77.025	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 13
1600	S453.006	Stephen Webster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S453.005.	Reject	Section 13
1601	FS20.004	Tim Bayley		Support	Accept	We need some real design direction for this city ... NOT open slather by developers who don't give a damn what happens to Nelson ... just in it for the $$$'s.	Reject	Section 9
1602	FS83.061	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1603	FS77.027	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 13

1604	S453.010	Stephen Webster	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1605	FS83.065	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1606	FS77.031	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 13
1607	S453.011	Stephen Webster	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 12
1608	FS28.027	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 in part	Section 12
1609	FS83.066	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1610	FS77.032	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 13
1611	S453.013	Stephen Webster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
1612	FS83.068	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1613	FS77.034	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 13
1614	S453.018	Stephen Webster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S453.005 and S453.011.	Reject	Section 13
1615	FS83.073	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12

1616	FS77.039	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 13
1617	S453.019	Stephen Webster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1618	FS83.074	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1619	FS77.040	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 13
1620	S453.027	Stephen Webster	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
1621	FS83.082	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1622	FS77.048	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 13
1623	S453.029	Stephen Webster	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1624	FS83.084	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1625	FS77.050	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 13

1626	S453.030	Stephen Webster	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1627	FS83.085	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1628	FS77.051	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 13
1629	S454.001	Jenny Meadows	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC 29 in its entirety.	I reject PC 29 in its entirety. From what I've read about this whole process, it's been slip-shod from the outset, without including from the beginning the residents it proposes to affect, and without research by technical experts of the areas proposed to be involved. I also I don't see how the proposed intensification mirrors the much-lower forecasted increase in the population of Nelson/Tasman in the next 30 years. Refer to reasons in submission points S454.002 - S454.005.	Reject	Section 9
1630	FS5.025	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 9
1631	S454.002	Jenny Meadows	Residential Zones	Oppose	Keep low-density housing zone in Atawhai.	This Plan change appears to allow 3- to 5-storey apartment buildings on Rainbow Drive and in Atawhai. I love my ocean view. I want my uninterrupted view of the sea and the nature reserve behind us. Nelson is the Sunshine Capital of NZ and is one of the reasons I moved here specifically. I love that we have a full veggie garden - we grow about half our food - as well as a lot of flowers and a few beautiful trees. I oppose anything that would block the sun from our precious plants. We also rely on the sun to heat the house during the day. Out here in Atawhai... some of the topography is flat or gently rising, but a lot of it is steep with scars from slips. Building below or above those areas would be unwise and possibly against NCC or government regulations. If it isn't, it should be. The area is also full of birds and birdsong and having multi-family dwellings and their cars would disturb the peace. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
1632	S454.005	Jenny Meadows	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent hearing panel.	I am alarmed when I read about the hearings panel. I doubt their ability to be objective and circumspect. An independent hearing panel, none of whom are elected councillors, should be appointed to read the many submissions about Plan Change 29.	Reject	Section 13
1633	S455.001	Philippa Hoult	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	SEEK withdrawal of PC29 by Council prior to calling for Further Submissions AND (if not withdrawn) SEEK rejection of the whole Plan Change 29.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S455.002.	Reject	Section 9
1634	S455.002	Philippa Hoult	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

1635	S455.003	Philippa Hoult	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent hearing panel (no current Councillors) to hear the submissions, and if that is not possible, appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, and if that is not possible, add two well qualified people who are not current Councillors to the Hearing Panel (for example, a demographer or a professional member of Nelson Tasman 2050).	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1636	S455.004	Philippa Hoult	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1637	S455.006	Philippa Hoult	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S455.005.	Reject	Section 13
1638	S455.010	Philippa Hoult	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1639	S455.011	Philippa Hoult	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 12
1640	FS28.028	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 in part	Section 12
1641	S455.013	Philippa Hoult	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
1642	S455.018	Philippa Hoult	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S455.005 and S455.011.	Reject	Section 13

1643	S455.019	Philippa Hoult	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1644	S455.027	Philippa Hoult	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. Impacts on mental health of living in multi-storey buildings providing social housing need to be considered. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1645	S455.029	Philippa Hoult	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1646	S455.030	Philippa Hoult	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1647	S455.031	Philippa Hoult	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Notify all ratepayers] directly by email or letter [about PC29], [or] at the very least, those property owners who will be directly affected by their property's zone being changed.	[All ratepayers] will be affected either directly or indirectly. Many property owners were in other parts of the country or overseas when PC29 was publicly notified and therefore likely to be unaware that their property is to be rezoned. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1648	S455.033	Philippa Hoult	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider advice from Nelson Tasman 2050.	Nelson Tasman 2050 'is an independent think tank of built environment professionals sketching pathways towards a better future. Our mission is to help create vibrant communities through advocating, promoting and supporting our transition to resilient, sustainable, affordable, equitable and community-focused urban environments through quality intensification.'	Accept in part	Section 9
1649	S455.038	Philippa Hoult	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] that Council identify and assess the social impact of PC29 and identifies strategies that might mitigated any potential effects on well-being and Nelson society in general.	The section 32 evaluation report is inadequate. This report does not fully consider the risk and impact to people's health, lifestyle and property value if a multi-storey building, especially over two storeys, is built next to them.	Reject	Section 13
1650	S456.004	Stephen Boulton	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 S456.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
1651	S456.006	Stephen Boulton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S456.001 and S456.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
1652	S456.012	Stephen Boulton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S456.010 and S456.011 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9

1653	S457.001	Laraine Rothenberg	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely. I am asking Council to withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design andthen put it back out for public submissions.	Because there does not appear to be consideration to the facts.	Reject	Section 13
1654	S457.006	Laraine Rothenberg	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA), with representatives from various areas in Nelson, to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S457.005.	Reject	Section 13
1655	S457.010	Laraine Rothenberg	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1656	S457.011	Laraine Rothenberg	Mapping	Oppose	Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district.	If any plan is adopted it must apply equally in impact to all property. The new General Residential Zone if adopted should equally across the entire Nelson district, on the basis that Daylight Admission protection rules will apply to all pre-existing properties.	Reject	Section 12
1657	FS28.029	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 in part	Section 12
1658	S457.027	Laraine Rothenberg	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appropriate areas should be found for this housing that does not impact existing residential neighbourhoods.	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 12
1659	S457.029	Laraine Rothenberg	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1660	S457.030	Laraine Rothenberg	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1661	S457.035	Laraine Rothenberg	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Require] Council voting members to [disclose] conflicts of interest.	I believe that each Council member voting on the proposal should indicate any possible conflicts of interests and relations with developers and real estate persons	Reject	Section 13
1662	S459.001	Solitaire Investments Limited	Mapping	Support	Support the proposed zones.	Solitaire generally supports the rezoning proposed and the introduction of more relaxed development standards. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12

1663	FS78.242	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: Support the proposed zones. 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. 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 12
1664	FS65.250	Heritage Nelson		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission we oppose is: Support the proposed 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. 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 in part	Section 13
1665	S460.001	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Support intensification as an urban development approach for Nelson.	While I support intensification as an urban development approach for Nelson, and support aspects of Plan Change 29, I do not support PC29 in its entirety... We have a variety of economic, demographic, environmental, geographic, and social reasons that compel us toward intensification... [including] Unaffordable housing and growing economic gap between top and bottom of our community... Intensification is a strategic response to our situation... More housing will lower the cost of housing, making our community more viable for young people, making a better economic environment for our businesses and commercial sectors. It also affords cheaper service delivery. Besides adding more affordable residential space, building up can allow us to have more buildings that host retail on some floors, commercial office space on others, and residential on others - all in the same building. This in turn has social benefits... [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
1666	S460.002	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Implement intensification in the urban core and urban fringe as per the Future Development Strategy [inferred].	Recognition of climate change, geography, economics, demographics and societal needs seemed to be the predicate for the overwhelming response from the community when a great many of us submitted on the Future Development Strategy (FDS). The people spoke through a democratic process. They want intensification. It is really only how this is to be accomplished that should be considered when evaluating Plan Change 29. Not intensifying should not be on the table for consideration. Of course, Nelson's statutory obligations to accommodate growth further confirm this is the right approach. The FDS was an extensively consulted on, and widely participated in process. The significant amount of public input and feedback contained in 568 submissions resulted in a FDS that is a democratically-constituted reflection of popular sentiment supporting urban intensification in our region, and has resulted in a set of intensification strategies completely congruent with the general thrust of Plan Change 29. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

1667	S460.003	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	Improve public engagement when communicating about the Plan Change [inferred].	Public engagement was too cursory for such a major change... The change was not well contextualised and expert opinion was not platformed... The portrayal of the change was not fine-grained enough. Neighbourhoods and individual properties needed to be given both more detail about what the plan meant for them, and to be given an opportunity to partner with council in determining how they wanted to accommodate intensification in their personal spheres. Misinformation has been allowed to creep into people's understanding of PC29 and this has caused uniformed opinion and gossip to overwhelm fact... Consenting Process Confusion - many people do not understand that the building consent process will still apply - so all standards will still have to be met. It is the resource consenting that will change as a result of PC29. This could have been made clearer from the outset. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1668	S460.005	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Create a spatial masterplan for where intensification should occur, using the following elements to generate options	Premise of 400M distance from an amenity. While this should be an element that generates options for where intensification should occur. It is a premise that has shortcomings, and therefore has opened NCC to more criticism. Lack of Masterplan - with no plan it is hard to say if the destination is the right one. PC29 may be the right mechanism, but without a plan, who knows? Lack of an open spaces plan and placemaking strategy - another lack of precursor planning that raises concerns and depletes public confidence. Lack of heritage protections - with minimal consideration and judicious appraisal missing in PC29, this has become a chink in the armour. Heritage, can be a debatable concept in such a young country however. Not all that is old or historic is worth preserving if the price is stymieing a better designed community. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1669	S460.006	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Widely apply well-designed, fine grained vertical intensification provisions across Nelson core/fringe/arteries linked to strategic goals and desirable outcomes for the community [inferred].	Intensification produces more meaningful outcomes such as making Nelson: More prosperous More equitable More liveable More sustainable More vital More productive More connected and connecting More healthful and happier More efficient and less wasteful (of both rates revenue and resources). NCC has not done a good job of explicitly connecting PC29 to desirable outcomes and strategic goals; and has therefore met resistance and a poor understanding of why there should be any short-term sacrifices for long term benefit. The connection between outcomes and mechanisms needs to be more overtly and specifically communicated, but equally important, the mechanisms needs to be intrinsic to the delivery of strategic goals and desirable outcomes for the community. Density decisions, then, should be quite site specific, or at least much more analytically granular than the broad-brush-stroke approach NCC seemed to apply when determining PC29 mapping. That said, ease of well-designed vertical intensification ought be widely applicable across Nelson core/fringe/arteries. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 9

1670	S460.007	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Apply a social outcomes approach to intensification locations [inferred].	Intensification in and of itself is not a desirable outcome, but intensification that creates better social outcomes is. The intensification strategy of basing intensification decisions strictly around a 400m radius from a public amenity that one might want to visit is an approach that is too limited and not grounded enough in an outcomes-based approach - a social outcomes approach. Nelson should be intensifying in ways that explicitly meets these social goals: Providing more affordable housing for young families - with close proximity to recreation and green spaces, and easily serviced by restaurants, green grocers, farmer's market, bakeries, etc. Providing housing for young people that is both affordable and builds community and sense of belonging among young people - with nearby venues for socialising, entertainment, hospitality and recreation. Providing residential spaces that are child friendly - near daycare, parks, recreation, greened city streets, playgrounds and schools - so that we make Nelson more child friendly and nurturing of children. Providing residences in mixed use buildings that house offices, retail, housing and personal services that enhance the lives of working people. Providing affordable housing for elderly people that puts them in the middle of city life, fighting isolation - but near parks, green spaces, medical services and places for socialisation - integrating elderly into daily city life. Providing lively pro-social places for young singles to socialise, meet, recreate and provide a "density" of social interactions - making Nelson an attractive place for young people, adding demographic balance and vitality to our city Providing housing that promotes social mixing among age groups, ethnicities, socio-economic status - intensification should have as an	Reject	Section 9
1671	S460.008	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Establish an Urban Development Agency to create design standards, a planning process, and design-based outcomes that produce intensification congruent with the desire of many Nelsonians to make sure their quality of life is not undermined by intensification. Such an UDA should be independent of direct control by council, but responsive to council.	Ultimately, in order to take a pro-social and outcomes-based approach to PC29 and urban development in general, Nelson needs to establish an Urban Development Agency. Such an UDA would create design standards, a planning process, and design-based outcomes that produce intensification congruent with the desire of many Nelsonians to make sure their quality of life is not undermined by intensification. An UDA would also allow Nelson to create as sustained, strategic approach to urban growth and revitalisation. Such an UDA should be independent of direct control by council, but responsive to council.	Reject	Section 13

1672	S460.009	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Create an Urban Design Guide to preserve and enhance quality of life through development and intensification [inferred].	A design driven approach led by an UDA would allay many of the existing concerns and misperceived threats many people have about PC29, and would produce the only kind of acceptable outcomes the community will sanction. Such a design-driven process should include elements such as: Urban design guide - widely used by many communities to ensure quality of life is preserved and enhanced through development and intensification. Architectural standards - again, widely used by many communities to protect and lift the standard of architectural contributions to a city - detailed but flexible enough to foster creativity, not flexible enough to enable greed. This would also be a valuable tool in providing protection and complements to heritage sites/structures. Urban design review panel - providing professional design oversight for changes to the city. No need to invent the wheel, as these are used around the world, and could easily be created for Nelson, based on successful models. Neighbourhood spatial plans that are fine grain - allowing variety within a neighbourhood, adaptability and accommodating evolving use patterns. Quality of life (QOL), heritage, social cohesion and other place-making factors would drive planning at this level. Qualitative approach - not quantitative--less use of formulas and more use of aesthetic & QOL considerations. What aesthetic goals do we have for our city? What are our QOL goals? Social goals? Based on the particulars of those answers, how should growth be accommodated, directed and enhanced for good outcomes? This should drive our decision-making and planning. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1673	S460.010	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Incorporate Architectural standards into the plan change.	Refer to reasons in submission point S460.009.	Reject	Section 9
1674	S460.011	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Utilize an urban design review panel to provide professional oversight for changes to the city [inferred].	Refer to reasons in submission point S460.009.	Accept	Section 13
1675	S460.012	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Create fine grained neighbourhood spatial plans with a qualitative approach based on aesthetic, quality of life, heritage, social cohesion and other place making considerations. Important details and subtleties should be considered at the precinct, neighbourhood, street, block and spaces (and even at the targeted section or individual site level). Creating a plan, not just a permission, based on conditions such as location, aspect, topography, access to services and amenities, overland flow paths, flood protection and watercourses, infrastructure, significant trees and vegetation, heritage items and commercial aspects like land value vs. capitalisation etc.	Refer to reasons in submission point S460.009 and the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 13
1676	FS78.023	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Neighbourhood Spatial plans including heritage considerations. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13

1677	FS65.252	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: Neighbourhood Spatial plans including heritage considerations. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
1678	S460.013	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Residential Zones	Support in part	Retain all high density designations in the area bordered by 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 Vanguard St to Hampden St to St Vincent St to Haven Rd to Wakefield Quay.	I am not convinced we have taken an adequate "spaces" approach to defining where intensification should occur. We need to look at this much more carefully, more granularly for the best outcomes. Taking NCCs more generalised approach, I am not sure we have that right either. 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 Vanguard St to Hampden St to St Vincent St to Haven Rd to Wakefield Quay all of the properties in this area should be CONSIDERED for Medium density and all High density designations in these areas should be retained. We need to look into this general area at much more granular level to make good decisions. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 13
1679	FS25.013	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 12
1680	S460.021	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Roll out PC29 changes strategically, over the next 15-20 years, in precinct, neighbourhoods, streets, arterial routes, along foothills, blocks, spaces (and even at the individual site or targeted section level).	Besides looking more carefully at how we define intensification spaces broadly, and looking more deeply and granularly within those broad spaces, we should also consider a slow rolling plan of phases of implementation. This might help ameliorate opposition from older residents. Areas with more entrenched opposition from older Nelsonians might be appeased more if they understood these changes were to be rolled out in phases around the city over the next 15-20 years (as a number of them are unlikely to be living in their houses then). This phased approach would allow NCC to roll out PC29 changes strategically in precinct, neighbourhoods, streets, arterial routes, along foothills, blocks, spaces (and even at the individual site or targeted section level) - this is a granular approach, which would allow NCC to target first areas likely to produce the best results and the best examples of intensification to showcase to the community -diluting fears and concerns, and inspiring confidence and enthusiasm for this kind of change.	Accept in part	Section 13

1681	S460.022	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Implement a transport oriented development design (TOD) to push growth on to arterial roads.	Urban planners and designers around the world have demonstrated, with research results to back this up, that transport oriented development design (TOD) produces the best quality of life, economic, and social outcomes for cities and towns. TOD involves planning cities around the transport needs of the population, making residential areas along arterials densely populated, but offset by generous green spaces, public spaces, walkability and placemaking. We should push growth to arterials, and the best designed cities around the world already do this (this is also beneficial because it also makes it cheaper for NCC to provide service delivery to more people - meaning a lower burden on ratepayers)... An example of this TOD approach: Milton St/Atawhai St should be made one-way north-flowing road all the way to Highway 6, with parking removed on one side of the street (buy a few properties to make some parking alcoves if necessary) a protected bike lane and much wider footpaths, encouragement of micro-mobility, and regular service by buses. This would then make sense to have intensified vertical housing development up and down this road. This is an example of where NCC is being too timid in how they are currently approaching intensification (and not focused on strategic outcomes - as this road is ripe for a strategic outcomes transformation). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1682	S460.025	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Set aside land as public green space.	Refer to reasons in submission point S460.024.	Accept in part	Section 13
1683	S460.026	Richard Brudvik-Lindner	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Convert poorly designed, underutilised streets, footpaths, carparks and other hard surfaces to green space.	Don't buy expensive green space, convert underutilised grey spaces for a fraction of the cost." Convert poorly designed, underutilised streets, footpaths, carparks and other hard surfaces to green space, all of which would make intensification more palatable to those who fear it, and more pleasant for those that embrace it. Again, through an UDA, we should do a survey of grey spaces, current green spaces and "pregnant spaces" capable of delivering greater greenery if converted from their current poorly allocated uses. Car parking spaces offer potential here, if done prudently, preserving car parking where needed. Much as the Buxton Square carpark housing proposed by Matt Lawrey.	Accept in part	Section 12
1684	S461.001	Jocelyn Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29.	I reject PC 29 in its entirety. Refer to reasons in submission points S461.002 and S461.007.	Reject	Section 9
1685	S461.002	Jocelyn Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw the plan, rewrite it in a clearer format and make sure we all understand what is being proposed.	The changes proposed are huge and documentation detailed and difficult to understand. I don't think there has been enough consultation or information about this Plan Change. It appears that it will cause a lot of angst to existing property owners. The plan is hard to understand and to work out what its implementation will mean. It's a huge document. I understand the problem you are trying to solve, and I listened to the zoom session and understand the reasoning behind the selection of areas to intensify, but the solution seems to be overkill. I don't really believe that Nelson's population will grow as fast as forecast. Please don't rush into this big box bulk housing plan.	Reject	Section 9
1686	S461.007	Jocelyn Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Provide] allowance for developments to be considered on a case-by-case basis with sensitivity to the wellbeing of the surrounding dwellings.	It doesn't seem to have enough flexibility to adapt to specific situations. There needs to be more allowance for developments to be considered on a case-by-case basis, with sensitivity to the wellbeing of the surrounding dwellings.	Reject	Section 10

1687	S462.001	Susan George	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Reject the changes [in Plan Change 29].	I would like the council to reject the change proposed for the general residential zone. The current planning criteria already allows for intensification in this zone but in a controlled and responsible way to preserve the quality desirability and character of the zone for both new and existing residents. There needs to be designated zones for this type of intensification rather than a broad blanket approach so people will know what they are signing up for when they purchase a property and not have to worry what might happen next door. Council needs to respect what residents of Nelson want in their neighbourhoods.	Accept in part	Section 12
1688	S463.001	Derek Smail and Julia Burbury	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	That no portion of the proposal be approved.	I oppose the proposal in its entirety. You should also be aware that we fully understand the good sense of encouraging intensification of high rise accommodation in the CBD - within the area bounded by the relevant parts of Halifax Street, Rutherford Street, Nile Street and Collingwood Street.	Accept in part	Section 12
1689	FS5.026	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 9
1690	S464.001	Rosemary Horn	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	I do not reject PC 29 in its entirety.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 12
1691	S464.008	Rosemary Horn	Entire Plan Change	Amend	[Include] provision for green belts through the city and suburbs.	Green belt provisions are missing from the plan. Nelson is very green as the sections are large with trees on them, with intensification the green spaces will be significantly reduced. Provision of green belts through the city and suburbs needs to be added to the plan. A good example is Wellington where you area about a 15 minute walk to a green belt. The location of the green belt could be in areas where the land is too steep or slip prone to build houses. By having these areas covered in trees and plants this could reduce slipping and potentially reduce the impact of slips on properties below or adjacent to these areas. There are areas that are very wet that used to be swamps or streams, the areas around these natural features could be widened to provide more space for flood waters, improving the health of these waterways and moving properties away from these higher risk areas whilst providing green spaces for recreation. There are many waterways through Nelson that are very confined or covered, there is an opportunity to establish a corridor from the sea to the mountains in developing a green belt plan, such as from the sea to Waimarama Sanctuary and from the Sea to the Mangatapu Mountain above the Maitai Dam. Providing ecological corridors for our native species and excellent recreation corridors from the city into our mountains.	Reject	Section 13
1692	S465.001	Mic Dover	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Constrain new intensification proposals to appropriate areas of the city.	Since NZ has just elected a government that wants to expand greenfield development (despite all the global evidence pointing to the stupidity of such a policy), it is now more important than ever to a) maximise brownfield intensification wherever appropriate; b) to implement such intensification in a way that local communities support; c) to make sure the intensification benefits people who are currently homeless or renting unaffordable homes or unable to buy their first home, rather than creating speculative opportunities for developers whose bottom line is profit not social good. There seems to have been a minimal or absent effort by NCC to properly assess the three precincts laid out in the changes envisaged i.e. General Residential Zone (GRZ) Medium General Residential Zone (GRZ), Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) and High Density Residential Zone (HDRZ), in terms of what will happen, and where, and the outcomes. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12

1693	S465.002	Mic Dover	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Expand the Hearing Panel to at least five with perhaps an architect and maybe a social housing developer added to it. Excluding councillors known to have differing views to the mayor is anti-democratic.	The size and composition of the panel are in serious breach of impartiality and risk being a slam dunk for the establishment view. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1694	S465.004	Mic Dover	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Review the data Plan Change 29 is depending on to make decisions on nelson's housing needs in the next 30 years.	Also, as pointed out by the highly experienced demographer at the meeting I attended, the demographic data for various NCC plans are based on highly dubious interpretations.	Reject	Section 10
1695	S465.007	Mic Dover	Mapping	Oppose in part	Propose that the CBD defined by Halifax, Rutherford, Selwyn and Collingwood precinct is sufficient for HDRZ buildings, and that should be its limit. MDRZ could then be perhaps extended out from the CBD as above, incrementally and as and when demand predicates such an outward expansion and ending at the current PC29 HDRZ boundary.	If we accept a degree of intensification is needed, then the planned HDRZ for the CBD is one with the least impact in terms of architecture, aesthetics and higher rise buildings, given that much of the HDRZ will lie within the CBD which already contains many higher rise buildings.	Accept in part	Section 12
1696	S466.001	Alan Stewart	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] the current NRMP rules in its present form.	I am strongly against the Nelson City Council PC29 plans to add MDZ and HDZ to the Tahunanui Hills. [Reasons for opposition to the MDZ and HDZ are detailed in the original submission, to summarise, these include]: Land stability [issues and concerns] in the proposed Tosswill Road/Tamaki Street HDZ area. [Lack of] services for high rise apartments in the Tosswill Road/Tamaki Street area [within a walkable distance of 400 m]. Narrow roads and limited parking. Suitability of eBuses for accessing the Tosswill Road, Stansell Avenue and Bisley Avenue route. [The potential reduction in] grass and garden areas [and increase in] sealed surfaces around high rise buildings [and the impact on] the storm water system to cope with increased runoff and less soakage into ground. Fire engine access in narrow ROW with 19.5 m high buildings. [Impacts of] shading from 19.5 m apartment buildings [on] conventional gardens, biodiversity, and native species habitat. Social issues and mental health issues which [will] arise from the loss of sunlight and loss of views [due to] HDZ buildings. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1697	FS61.048	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- I am strongly against the Nelson City Council PC29 plans to add MDZ and HDZ to the Tahunanui Hills. [Reasons for opposition to the MDZ and HDZ are detailed in the original submission, to summarise, these include]: Land stability [issues and concerns] in the proposed Tosswill Road/Tamaki Street HDZ area. [Lack of] services for high rise apartments in the Tosswill Road/Tamaki Street area [within a walkable distance of 400 m]. Narrow roads and limited parking. Suitability of eBuses for accessing the Tosswill Road, Stansell Avenue and Bisley Avenue route. [The potential reduction in] grass and garden areas [and increase in] sealed surfaces around high rise buildings [and the impact on] the storm water system to cope with increased runoff and less soakage into ground. Fire engine access in narrow ROW with 19.5 m high buildings. [Impacts of] shading from 19.5 m apartment buildings [on] conventional gardens, biodiversity, and native species habitat. Social issues and mental health issues which [will] arise from the loss of sunlight and loss of views [due to] HDZ buildings. [Refer to original submission for more detail] Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support - No public transport with cycleways or bus routes, land instability and social & mental health ramifications.	Accept in part	Section 12

1698	FS72.052	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- I am strongly against the Nelson City Council PC29 plans to add MDZ and HDZ to the Tahunanui Hills. [Reasons for opposition to the MDZ and HDZ are detailed in the original submission, to summarise, these include]: Land stability [issues and concerns] in the proposed Tosswill Road/Tamaki Street HDZ area. [Lack of] services for high rise apartments in the Tosswill Road/Tamaki Street area [within a walkable distance of 400 m]. Narrow roads and limited parking. Suitability of eBuses for accessing the Tosswill Road, Stansell Avenue and Bisley Avenue route. [The potential reduction in] grass and garden areas [and increase in] sealed surfaces around high rise buildings [and the impact on] the storm water system to cope with increased runoff and less soakage into ground. Fire engine access in narrow ROW with 19.5 m high buildings. [Impacts of] shading from 19.5 m apartment buildings [on] conventional gardens, biodiversity, and native species habitat. Social issues and mental health issues which [will] arise from the loss of sunlight and loss of views [due to] HDZ buildings. [Refer to original submission for more detail]. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support - No public transport with cycleways or bus routes, land instability and social & mental health ramifications.	Accept in part	Section 12
1699	FS60.044	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- I am strongly against the Nelson City Council PC29 plans to add MDZ and HDZ to the Tahunanui Hills. [Reasons for opposition to the MDZ and HDZ are detailed in the original submission, to summarise, these include]: Land stability [issues and concerns] in the proposed Tosswill Road/Tamaki Street HDZ area. [Lack of] services for high rise apartments in the Tosswill Road/Tamaki Street area [within a walkable distance of 400 m]. Narrow roads and limited parking. Suitability of eBuses for accessing the Tosswill Road, Stansell Avenue and Bisley Avenue route. [The potential reduction in] grass and garden areas [and increase in] sealed surfaces around high rise buildings [and the impact on] the storm water system to cope with increased runoff and less soakage into ground. Fire engine access in narrow ROW with 19.5 m high buildings. [Impacts of] shading from 19.5 m apartment buildings [on] conventional gardens, biodiversity, and native species habitat. Social issues and mental health issues which [will] arise from the loss of sunlight and loss of views [due to] HDZ buildings. [Refer to original submission for more detail]. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support - No public transport with cycleways or bus routes, land instability and social & mental health ramifications.	Accept in part	Section 12
1700	S466.002	Alan Stewart	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Retain] the current NRMP rules in its present form.	I am strongly against the Nelson City Council PC29 plans to add MDZ and HDZ to the Tahunanui Hills. Refer to the reasons in submission point S466.001.	Reject	Section 13
1701	S466.004	Alan Stewart	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Utilise the medium population projection [inferred].	Why is Nelson City Council planning for a 'high population increase' for Nelson city when all the official data over the last two years indicate that the medium projection of the population at 59,000 residents is more accurate. The council may be planning for 5,000 to 7,000 more residents than can be justified. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1702	S467.004	Tasha Workman	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 S467.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
1703	S467.006	Tasha Workman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S467.001 and S467.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12

1704	S467.007	Tasha Workman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
1705	S467.008	Tasha Workman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
1706	S467.011	Tasha Workman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Object to Plan Change 29.	Some reasons include infrastructure, traffic, limited parking.	Reject	Section 11
1707	S467.012	Tasha Workman	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Suggest] look for more suitable areas [for development], [such as] Waimea Road (opposite Caltex).	Houses are in a declining state, access to town is quick.	Reject	Section 12
1708	S467.013	Tasha Workman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Adjust restrictions on tiny homes.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 12
1709	S468.001	Synagogue Lane	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose Plan Change 29.	We believe that Plan Change 29 is unfair and harmful to current residents in our area, as well as being ill-conceived and not demonstrably to the benefit of future Nelson. For these reasons, we, residents of 1,3,4 Synagogue Lane/358 Trafalgar Square oppose it. We do not believe three or six-storey developments should be allowed to be built through our existing family neighbourhoods, especially without resource consent. Multi-storeyed developments, such as those proposed, tend to exacerbate traffic congestion and parking problems. Our roads, utilities and public services haven't been designed to cope with anything more than one-two storey developments Three or six storeyed apartments looming over single storey family homes will also cast shadows over these properties, block natural light and be a significant invasion of privacy. The introduction of six or even three storey apartments through our neighbourhood could significantly impact property values in the vicinity. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12
1710	FS78.025	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Not appropriate in our area. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13
1711	FS65.255	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Not appropriate in our area. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
1712	S468.002	Synagogue Lane	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Explore opportunities for enhancing these neighbourhoods in other ways, such as two storeyed apartments or 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
1713	S469.001	Jontaine White	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S469.002.	Reject	Section 13
1714	S469.002	Jontaine White	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

1715	S469.003	Jontaine White	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1716	S469.004	Jontaine White	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1717	S469.006	Jontaine White	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S469.005.	Reject	Section 13
1718	S469.010	Jontaine White	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1719	S469.011	Jontaine White	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 12
1720	FS28.030	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 in part	Section 12
1721	S469.013	Jontaine White	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
1722	S469.018	Jontaine White	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S469.005 and S469.011.	Reject	Section 13
1723	S469.019	Jontaine White	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10

1724	S469.027	Jontaine White	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
1725	S469.029	Jontaine White	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1726	S469.030	Jontaine White	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1727	S470.001	Amanda White	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S470.002.	Reject	Section 13
1728	S470.002	Amanda White	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1729	S470.003	Amanda White	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1730	S470.004	Amanda White	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1731	S470.006	Amanda White	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S470.005.	Reject	Section 13
1732	S470.010	Amanda White	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1733	S470.011	Amanda White	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 12

1734	FS28.031	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 in part	Section 12
1735	S470.013	Amanda White	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
1736	S470.018	Amanda White	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S470.005 and S470.011.	Reject	Section 13
1737	S470.019	Amanda White	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 10
1738	S470.027	Amanda White	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
1739	S470.029	Amanda White	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1740	S470.030	Amanda White	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1741	S472.001	Carol Webster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S472.002.	Reject	Section 13
1742	S472.002	Carol Webster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

1743	S472.003	Carol Webster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1744	S472.004	Carol Webster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1745	S472.006	Carol Webster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S472.005.	Reject	Section 13
1746	S472.010	Carol Webster	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1747	FS20.007	Tim Bayley		Support	Accept	High density should NOT be in existing residential zones ... keep it in the CBD or along under the hills where it's shading effects few if anyone.	Accept in part	Section 12
1748	S472.011	Carol Webster	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 12
1749	FS28.032	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 in part	Section 12
1750	S472.013	Carol Webster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
1751	S472.018	Carol Webster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S472.005 and S472.011.	Reject	Section 13
1752	S472.019	Carol Webster	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10

1753	S472.027	Carol Webster	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
1754	S472.029	Carol Webster	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1755	S472.030	Carol Webster	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1756	S473.001	Helen Black	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw Plan Change 29 and go back to the community and look into what other Western countries do to build affordable apartments and keep green areas and make them people friendly.	I reject this proposal mainly based on my experience of growing up in high intensity housing areas in Stockholm, Sweden. All areas with high rise buildings in Sweden have trees, planned parks/green areas for walking, children's playgrounds, picnics with safe footpaths and cycling areas. This is a must for providing both physical and mental healthy living. Other reasons include: - I question the intensification of this hilly region because of the heavy price on lack of green areas, safe roads, footpaths and cycling areas. It's already too congested due to old planning and hills. - I question why NZ apartments are unaffordable for most people. In the rest of the world most people can afford to live in apartments, but not in New Zealand. - I ask NCC to be mindful of allowing new developments in damp, shady areas. - Current infra structure is not fit to deal with existing housing. I also question the capacity requirement for storm water around the city. - Flawed population projections. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1757	S473.012	Helen Black	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Release the the population projections prepared by DOT consulting for public scrutiny and commentary. Peer review the projections carried out by DOT under contract to the NCC by qualified specialists. Only after a peer review, prepare a new HBL using a set of projections supported by a consensus of experts and community representatives.	Support the reasons set out in the submission of Dr G R Hayes on pages 4-5. Publishing a higher percentage population growth rate than is warranted has the effect of over-stating future population increase and therefore exaggerating the need for Plan Change 29. Also, when local governments and territorial authorities are competing for funds from the central government, a difference of 7 percentage points may well be highly significant.	Reject	Section 10
1758	S474.001	Geoffrey Hayes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Withdraw PC29 and undertake revisions based on community input.	There have been serious shortcomings in the process by which citizens and ratepayers of Nelson have been informed about Plan Change 29 and the arrangements put in place to obtain public input to the proposal.... There was limited access to key documents, such as the NCC's Section 32 Evaluation Report and appendices... The plan change deserves a much longer period for public review and the formulation of submissions... [Refer to Part 1 in the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

1759	FS31.004	Stephen Webster		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Withdraw PC29 and undertake revisions based on community input. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1760	FS78.008	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission I support are: Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives. This is not sustainable, precautionary planning. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. Provisions for intensification are based on quantitative not qualitative measures. PPC29 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 12
1761	FS72.004	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Withdraw PC29 and undertake revisions based on community input. This plan is out of step with the NZ Central Government's proposed plans for development. The NZ Government has indicated a lack of support for the previous Government's position on densification. Until more direction is given, this has the potential to be a waste of Council and Ratepayers' funds and time following an outdated Central Government brief. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1762	FS66.006	Carol Webster		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Withdraw PC29 and undertake revisions based on community input. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1763	FS61.004	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Withdraw PC29 and undertake revisions based on community input. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13

1764	FS76.004	Robert Stevenson(1)		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Withdraw PC29 and undertake revisions based on community input. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1765	FS54.004	Nicole Gibson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Withdraw PC29 and undertake revisions based on community input. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1766	FS53.004	Susan Gibson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Withdraw PC29 and undertake revisions based on community input. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1767	FS46.004	Dan McGuire		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Withdraw PC29 and undertake revisions based on community input. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1768	FS77.004	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Withdraw PC29 and undertake revisions based on community input. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1769	FS58.004	Robert Stevenson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Withdraw PC29 and undertake revisions based on community input. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13

1770	FS60.004	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support: Withdraw PC29 and undertake revisions based on community input. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
1771	S474.002	Geoffrey Hayes	Mapping	Oppose in part	Change the Medium Density Residential Zone area in Atawhai to General Density Residential Zone.	The proposal to make parts of Atawhai North "Medium Density" housing zone would have negative consequences for the environment and people of Atawhai... [Refer to reasons in submission points S474.009 to S474.014 and Part 3 in the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1772	S474.003	Geoffrey Hayes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Stop using the NCC's flawed population projections of 2020 as [the basis for the] Future Development Strategy or in support of plan changes such as PC29.	The analysis of past and projected future population growth in Nelson undertaken by the Nelson City Council (NCC) is seriously flawed, thus undermining the primary rationale for Plan Change 29... In its public statements and various Council documents, the NCC has been providing misleading information on past and projected future population growth in Nelson City in the context of promoting and justifying the need for Plan Change 29. This misleading information ranges from relatively minor errors to more serious statistical deficiencies... In the context of the announcement of plan change 29, publishing a higher percentage population growth rate than is warranted has the effect of over-stating future population increase and therefore exaggerating the need for Plan Change 29... [Refer to Part 2 in the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1773	FS31.012	Stephen Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Stop using NCC's flawed population projections of 2020. This has been used as a basis for the scale of intensification required.	Reject	Section 10
1774	FS78.010	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Stop using NCC's flawed population projections of 2020. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. Population projections on which PPC29 is based are flawed.	Reject	Section 10
1775	FS83.086	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Submitter is well qualified to comment and question assessment of flawed and incorrect population predictions used in PC29.	Reject	Section 10
1776	FS72.012	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Stop using NCC's flawed population projections of 2020. This has been used as a basis for the scale of intensification required.	Reject	Section 10
1777	FS66.014	Carol Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Stop using NCC's flawed population projections of 2020. This has been used as a basis for the scale of intensification required.	Reject	Section 10
1778	FS61.012	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Stop using NCC's flawed population projections of 2020. This has been used as a basis for the scale of intensification required.	Reject	Section 10
1779	FS76.012	Robert Stevenson(1)		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Stop using NCC's flawed population projections of 2020. This has been used as a basis for the scale of intensification required.	Reject	Section 10
1780	FS54.012	Nicole Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Stop using NCC's flawed population projections of 2020. This has been used as a basis for the scale of intensification required.	Reject	Section 10
1781	FS53.012	Susan Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Stop using NCC's flawed population projections of 2020. This has been used as a basis for the scale of intensification required.	Reject	Section 10
1782	FS46.012	Dan McGuire		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Stop using NCC's flawed population projections of 2020. This has been used as a basis for the scale of intensification required.	Reject	Section 10
1783	FS77.012	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Stop using NCC's flawed population projections of 2020. This has been used as a basis for the scale of intensification required.	Reject	Section 10

1784	FS58.012	Robert Stevenson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Stop using NCC's flawed population projections of 2020. This has been used as a basis for the scale of intensification required.	Reject	Section 10
1785	FS60.012	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Stop using NCC's flawed population projections of 2020. This has been used as a basis for the scale of intensification required.	Reject	Section 10
1786	S474.004	Geoffrey Hayes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Release the population projections prepared by DOT consulting for public scrutiny and expert commentary immediately.	The Tasman District Council and the Nelson City Council have jointly commissioned a new set of population projections from a consulting firm (DOT Consulting). The report on these projections is dated March 2023... I can find no mention of the report of these projections on the Nelson City Webpage, nor in media reports... That the NCC has had this report in its possession since at least March 2023 and not released it to the public, or otherwise mentioned it in the context of Plan Change 29, is a matter of great concern... A preliminary review by this submitter (a qualified demographer) is that the DOT report is a major improvement on the projections used in Nelson's FDS and HBA and being used to justify Plan Change 29. So far as one can tell from the report, the methodology employed is sound. The difficulty that arises is that the DOT projections result in a similar gap between Statistics NZ's medium projection and the DOT medium projection... The difference in the total projected population up to 2048 between the two projections appears to be entirely due to higher assumed net migration in the working age range of 15-64... The migration assumptions contained in the DOT projection should be further assessed before the DOT projections are used in connection with Plan Change 29 or for other planning purposes. [Refer to Part 2 in the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1787	FS83.087	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Submitter is well qualified to comment and question assessment of flawed and incorrect population predictions used in PC29.	Reject	Section 10
1788	S474.005	Geoffrey Hayes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Arrange for a peer review of the projections carried out by DOT under contract to the NCC by qualified specialists. Specifically, the peer review should focus on the migration assumptions employed by DOT under direction from NCC.	Refer to reasons in submission point S474.004 and Part 2 in the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 10
1789	FS31.013	Stephen Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: NCC's Population projections are flawed. Arrange a peer review of the projections carried out by DOT, under contract to NCC.	Reject	Section 10
1790	FS83.088	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Submitter is well qualified to comment and question assessment of flawed and incorrect population predictions used in PC29.	Reject	Section 10
1791	FS72.013	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: NCC's Population projections are flawed. Arrange a peer review of the projections carried out by DOT, under contract to NCC.	Reject	Section 10
1792	FS66.015	Carol Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: NCC's Population projections are flawed. Arrange a peer review of the projections carried out by DOT, under contract to NCC.	Reject	Section 10
1793	FS61.013	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: NCC's Population projections are flawed. Arrange a peer review of the projections carried out by DOT, under contract to NCC.	Reject	Section 10
1794	FS76.013	Robert Stevenson(1)		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: NCC's Population projections are flawed. Arrange a peer review of the projections carried out by DOT, under contract to NCC.	Reject	Section 10
1795	FS54.013	Nicole Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: NCC's Population projections are flawed. Arrange a peer review of the projections carried out by DOT, under contract to NCC.	Reject	Section 10

1796	FS53.013	Susan Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: NCC's Population projections are flawed. Arrange a peer review of the projections carried out by DOT, under contract to NCC.	Reject	Section 10
1797	FS46.013	Dan McGuire		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: NCC's Population projections are flawed. Arrange a peer review of the projections carried out by DOT, under contract to NCC.	Reject	Section 10
1798	FS77.013	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: NCC's Population projections are flawed. Arrange a peer review of the projections carried out by DOT, under contract to NCC.	Reject	Section 10
1799	FS58.013	Robert Stevenson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: NCC's Population projections are flawed. Arrange a peer review of the projections carried out by DOT, under contract to NCC.	Reject	Section 10
1800	FS60.013	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: NCC's Population projections are flawed. Arrange a peer review of the projections carried out by DOT, under contract to NCC.	Reject	Section 10
1801	S474.006	Geoffrey Hayes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Form a working group of economists and other social scientist along with business and community representatives and the Nelson Development Agency to formulate a more realistic set of migration assumptions based on the economic development prospects for Nelson.	Refer to reasons in submission point S474.004 and Part 2 in the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 10
1802	FS83.089	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Submitter is well qualified to comment and question assessment of flawed and incorrect population predictions used in PC29.	Reject	Section 10
1803	S474.007	Geoffrey Hayes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Prepare a new Housing Bottom Line (HBL), after a peer review [as requested by submission point S474.005] using a set of projections supported by a consensus of experts and community representatives [as requested by submission point S474.006] . Ensure that the "competitive margin" is applied correctly and transparently in this HBL.	Because the Nelson City Council's projection is "inherently flawed" in a demographic sense, and fails to meet the requirement of the NPSUD Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, the Housing Bottom Line included in the NCC's Housing and Business Capacity Report of July 2021 (HBA) is of questionable validity... [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
1804	FS83.090	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Submitter is well qualified to comment and question assessment of flawed and incorrect population predictions used in PC29.	Reject	Section 10
1805	S474.008	Geoffrey Hayes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Appoint an impartial hearing panel to hear PC29.	Some members of the panel that will hear submissions from the public on PC29 are apparently not unbiased or impartial, as required by the New Zealand Bill of Rights... Some members of the panel, in their capacity as City Councilors, are also decision-makers on Plan Change 29. As The New Zealand Bill of Rights Section 27, principle (3) notes, parties to a hearing such as on Plan Change 29 under the RMA, are entitled to be heard by an unbiased and impartial tribunal. However, some of the Councillors who are also panel members have indicated a pre-existing bias by voting in support of PC29. All members of the panel should be independent. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1806	FS5.024	Warwick Rogers		Support	Accept	The make up of the proposed panel is very suspect, the 2 councilors on the panel have already indicated they support the plan in it's entirely. An investigation needs to be held to determine who did this, and changes implemented to prevent this sort of corruption happening again.	Reject	Section 13
1807	FS31.015	Stephen Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an impartial Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13

1808	FS78.005	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Panel members should be impartial. The Hearing Panel makeup needs to be reviewed due to perceived conflicts of interest. Perception of bias on Panel due to part support of Plan Change.	Reject	Section 13
1809	FS72.015	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an impartial Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
1810	FS66.017	Carol Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an impartial Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
1811	FS61.015	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an impartial Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
1812	FS76.015	Robert Stevenson(1)		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an impartial Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
1813	FS54.015	Nicole Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an impartial Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
1814	FS53.015	Susan Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an impartial Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
1815	FS46.015	Dan McGuire		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an impartial Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
1816	FS77.015	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an impartial Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
1817	FS58.015	Robert Stevenson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an impartial Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
1818	FS60.015	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an impartial Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
1819	S474.016	Geoffrey Hayes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Form a Council run land accumulation company to facilitate redevelopment of the area between Vanguard Street and St Vincent Street from Gloucester to Northesk Street and reduce the focus on light commercial.	Refer to reasons in submission point S474.015.	Reject	Section 12
1820	S475.001	Kirsten Roedsgaard	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Design comprehensive neighborhood plans focusing on the location and look of future buildings, open spaces incl. public and private green spaces, lane ways, playgrounds etc.	I am partly in favour of intensification in Nelson but it seems like the Plan Change 29 has not really considered the design aspects of this enormous project. Design is such an important part of our lives and if we get it wrong, it can have devastating effects! I believe, like many professionals and other lay people, that for this plan to go ahead NCC needs to do a lot more work towards getting it right! It is as if NCC thinks "one plan fits all!" Well, it doesn't! I fear, that with the current plan, Nelsonians could potentially have multi-storey right next to residential properties of one of two storeys. Now, I cannot imagine anyone keen on that. Also, in the CBD, clever design ideas need to be considered. I urge the NCC to engage with professional urban planners, designers and architects for Nelson not only to intensify but also to beautify our city and make it and even more desirable place to live.	Accept in part	Section 13
1821	FS78.026	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Develop neighbourhood plans. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13

1822	FS65.262	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: Develop neighbourhood plans. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
1823	S476.001	Gaile Noonan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw the Plan Change as proposed and resubmit when neighbourhood plans and demographics work has been completed and aligned with Tasman District Council. If a decision is made to proceed to Hearing then opposed in entirety and reject recommendations from Hearings Panel.	First, I acknowledge that planning for the future growth must be done. However, the process undertaken for this plan change is lacking in a number of ways. Specifically, no consultation with the majority of the community and recommendations made through the Future Development Strategy, which was adopted, have not been followed. This has led to a fractured plan change as now Proposed. A Plan needs to be developed with the intended direction and scale of development well socialised with the community before notification, so consideration of community views informs the drafting directions. The current proposed plan did not give the community an opportunity to see the scale and extent of the development proposed. It is very different in scale to what the council had consulted on in plan development stages that the community was last provided with (e.g. maximum of 3 storeys to now 6 storeys).	Reject	Section 13
1824	FS78.027	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Develop neighbourhood plans. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13
1825	FS65.263	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: Develop neighbourhood plans. 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 13
1826	FS83.091	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1827	S476.002	Gaile Noonan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Request Council to refuse/reject Plan Change 29.	I oppose all of the plan change 29, as drafted. The proposed plan does not demonstrate design with consideration to mental health and well-being- green spaces, neighbourhood parks, sunshine, light etc. Well-being is a local government responsibility. Any plan change needs to be based around the principles of community living and well-being and not be driven by rules-based thinking but to deliver community outcomes. Refer to reasons in submission points S476.003 - S476.006.	Reject	Section 12
1828	FS83.092	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1829	S476.003	Gaile Noonan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Research and confirm growth projections and align to TDC methodology.	The growth projections (being the basis of the proposed plan change) have been publicly challenged by professional persons and should be redone aligning with TDC as per the FDS resolutions and FDS Plan. Refer to relevant portions of the Future Development Strategy attached as page 5 to the original submission.	Reject	Section 10
1830	FS83.093	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1831	S476.004	Gaile Noonan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Develop neighbourhood plans for all areas but prioritise the CBD and work out, slowly over time as growth is proven.	The plan should include a staged approach rather than a scatter gun approach around most of the city. Building high-rise buildings in an unplanned, adhoc manner puts existing low rise environments at risk.	Reject	Section 10
1832	FS65.264	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: Develop neighbourhood plans. 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 13
1833	FS83.094	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12

1834	S478.002	Nelson Airport Limited	Infrastructure	Support	With the exception of the relief sought in submission point S478.001 above, retain all existing residential zonings in areas that are located outside PC29 residential intensification areas.	These areas have been specifically excluded from further intensification under PC29 due to their location either entirely or partly within various overlays including the proposed Airport Effects Control Overlay, liquefaction overlay, flood area overlays and inundation overlay. Consequently, they have been identified as being unsuitable for further intensification as a permitted activity beyond what is provided for under their current zoning permitted rules. NAL supports this strategic approach particularly as it relates to recognising and managing the role and function of Nelson Airport.	Reject	Section 12
1835	FS51.002	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 9
1836	FS83.099	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Oppose	Reject	No reason stated.	Reject	Section 9
1837	S478.003	Nelson Airport Limited	Infrastructure	Support	With the exception of the relief sought in S478.001 above, continue to exclude all open space and recreation zone zonings from the scope of PC29.	Supports the exclusion of the Open Space and Recreation zone from the scope of PC29, and considers that in any case, it is not appropriate to intensify that zone for residential development as it is not intended for long term/permanent accommodation, residential activities or intensification.	Reject	Section 12
1838	FS51.003	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 9
1839	FS83.100	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Oppose	Reject	No reason stated.	Reject	Section 9
1840	S479.001	Maureen Doherty	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC 29 in its entirety.	I reject PC 29 in its entirety. Refer to the reasons in submission points S479.002 to S479.010.	Reject	Section 9
1841	S479.002	Maureen Doherty	Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove HDZ in residential areas where there is no walkable access to amenities [inferred].	I oppose the proposed HDZ in residential areas where is no walkable access to amenities (supermarkets, schools with safe crossing of main highway and public transport).	Accept in part	Section 12
1842	S479.005	Maureen Doherty	Mapping	Oppose	Remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ.	If HDZ are approved for some areas, I particularly oppose the proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui hills because of ongoing slope instability and 'run off' that is accelerated during high rainfall periods made worse by aging underground infrastructure on most properties. With the increased likelihood of slips caused by intensification and more frequent weather events this is of grave concern. The fact that there is a lack of essential amenities like a supermarket or public transport that are given as reasons for HDZ is an additional reason for asking the Council to make it GRZ instead. [Refer to the following sections of the original submission for more detail: 1. Slope Instability, 2. Amenities, 3. Traffic, and 4. Sunlight and Shading Effects].	Accept in part	Section 12

1843	FS61.080	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- If HDZ are approved for some areas, I particularly oppose the proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui hills because of ongoing slope instability and 'run off' that is accelerated during high rainfall periods made worse by aging underground infrastructure on most properties. With the increased likelihood of slips caused by intensification and more frequent weather events this is of grave concern. The fact that there is a lack of essential amenities like a supermarket or public transport that are given as reasons for HDZ is an additional reason for asking the Council to make it GRZ instead. [Refer to the following sections of the original submission for more detail: 1. Slope Instability, 2. Amenities, 3. Traffic, and 4. Sunlight and Shading Effects]. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Agree no HDZ on the Tahunanui hills.	Accept in part	Section 12
1844	FS72.084	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- If HDZ are approved for some areas, I particularly oppose the proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui hills because of ongoing slope instability and 'run off' that is accelerated during high rainfall periods made worse by aging underground infrastructure on most properties. With the increased likelihood of slips caused by intensification and more frequent weather events this is of grave concern. The fact that there is a lack of essential amenities like a supermarket or public transport that are given as reasons for HDZ is an additional reason for asking the Council to make it GRZ instead. [Refer to the following sections of the original submission for more detail: 1. Slope Instability, 2. Amenities, 3. Traffic, and 4. Sunlight and Shading Effects]. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Agree no HDZ on the Tahunanui hills.	Accept in part	Section 12
1845	FS60.076	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- If HDZ are approved for some areas, I particularly oppose the proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui hills because of ongoing slope instability and 'run off' that is accelerated during high rainfall periods made worse by aging underground infrastructure on most properties. With the increased likelihood of slips caused by intensification and more frequent weather events this is of grave concern. The fact that there is a lack of essential amenities like a supermarket or public transport that are given as reasons for HDZ is an additional reason for asking the Council to make it GRZ instead. [Refer to the following sections of the original submission for more detail: 1. Slope Instability, 2. Amenities, 3. Traffic, and 4. Sunlight and Shading Effects]. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Agree no HDZ on the Tahunanui hills.	Accept in part	Section 12
1846	S479.006	Maureen Doherty	Residential Zones	Support	Work with neighbourhood communities to design buildings, green spaces, and neighbourhoods [inferred].	I support the Council working with neighbourhood communities to design innovative and sustainable buildings and green spaces that make far better use of areas of older state type houses that are past their best by date and make a better use of flat land that is often on main roads within easy walking of public transport, schools and the hospital. Homes could be of varying sizes and hopefully enable mixed age groups including families to be part of a real community that people are proud to be part of.	Reject	Section 13
1847	S479.007	Maureen Doherty	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw PC 29 and have planning staff refine the plan design and follow the proper procedure of consultation and public engagement.	In my opinion, the PC 29 process needs to be paused and re-evaluated before progressing to the hearing stage.	Reject	Section 13

1848	S479.008	Maureen Doherty	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Inform all rate payers individually with emails and letters about any changesto their property zoning and to give each rate payer the opportunity to respond.	I have found the lack of early public engagement and consultation on Plan Change 29 extremely stressful. We found out only by chance when a neighbour phoned us two nights before the meeting at the Trafalgar Centre. There was no direct communication from the NCC. This is simply inadequate!	Reject	Section 13
1849	S479.009	Maureen Doherty	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint independent hearing commissioners for the plan change.	I question why the hearing panel is not made up of independent hearing commissioners for the plan change. There is a distinct lack of trust in the having two councillors with perceived 'conflicts of interest' and that it is a Council- led plan.	Reject	Section 13
1850	S479.010	Maureen Doherty	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC for population growth which have informed the intensification requirements are not Statistics NZ medium projections.	Reject	Section 10
1851	S480.001	Yvonne Percy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S480.002.	Reject	Section 13
1852	S480.002	Yvonne Percy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1853	S480.003	Yvonne Percy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1854	S480.004	Yvonne Percy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
1855	S480.006	Yvonne Percy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S480.005.	Reject	Section 13
1856	S480.010	Yvonne Percy	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1857	S480.011	Yvonne Percy	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 12
1858	FS28.033	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 in part	Section 12

1859	S480.013	Yvonne Percy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
1860	S480.018	Yvonne Percy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S480.005 and S480.011.	Reject	Section 13
1861	S480.019	Yvonne Percy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1862	S480.027	Yvonne Percy	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
1863	S480.029	Yvonne Percy	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1864	S480.030	Yvonne Percy	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
1865	S481.002	Pip Swale	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC 29 in its entirety.	I reject PC29 in its entirety. Refer to reasons in submission points S481.003 - S481.009.	Reject	Section 9
1866	S481.005	Pip Swale	Entire Plan Change	Support	Prioritise intensification within the inner city before moving onto existing residential neighbourhoods [inferred].	I support the proposed increase in residential density in the inner city with mixed residential and commercial zones as these areas provide residents with direct walkable access to shopping and public transport services. The inner city should be the starting place for the most significant intensification.	Accept in part	Section 12
1867	S481.006	Pip Swale	Mapping	Oppose	Remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ.	If HDZ is approved for some areas, I particularly oppose the proposed HDZ in the Tāhunanui Hills area. I ask the Council to remove Tāhunanui Hills from the proposed HDZand make it GRZ because of ongoing slope instability in this area, lack of infrastructure, lack of the essential amenities (no supermarkets or public transport) within walking distance, and the increased likelihood of slips directly caused by intensification development and frequent weather events. [Refer to the following sections of the original submission for more detail: 1. Slope Instability, 2. Amenities, 3. Traffic, 4. Sunlight and Shading Effects, 5. Trees and Gardens in the Tahunanui Hills HDZ, and 7. Intensification].	Accept in part	Section 12

1868	S481.010	Pip Swale	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw PC29 and have planning staff refine the plan design and follow the proper procedure of consultation and public engagement.	In my opinion, the PC29 process needs to be paused and re-evaluated before progressing to the hearing stage.	Reject	Section 13
1869	S481.011	Pip Swale	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint independent hearing commissioners for the plan change.	I question why the hearing panel is not made up of independent hearing commissioners as it is a council led plan change.	Reject	Section 13
1870	S481.012	Pip Swale	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC for population growth which have informed the intensification requirements are not Statistics NZ medium projections.	Reject	Section 10
1871	S481.013	Pip Swale	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Inform all rate payers individually with emails and letters about any changes to their property zoning and to give each ratepayer the opportunity to respond.	I feel there has been a lack of early public engagement and consultation on Plan Change 29. The Plan Change 29 severely affects all Nelson residents however, there was no letter or email from the Nelson City Council.	Reject	Section 13
1872	S482.001	Diane Goodman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose the PC29 submission process].	Lack of prior consultation, lack of proper timely information and majority of Councilors' arrogance in forcing this through. The inability of Councillors to understand the implications of such far reaching and legally binding laws with the potential to penalise the established homeowners and ratepayers who they are paid to represent.	Reject	Section 13
1873	S482.002	Diane Goodman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose the NCC PC29].	The proposed plan, if not modified, will entirely alter the face of this city. The urgency given to this Plan without appropriate care and consideration of the possible serious implications. I refer you to Dr Geoffrey Hayes' submission and the evidence based facts he endorses. I also refer you to the many well attended public meetings called by concerned Nelson ratepayers.	Reject	Section 9
1874	S482.003	Diane Goodman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose the NCC PC29].	The population density proposal is not based on correct evidence.	Reject	Section 9
1875	S482.004	Diane Goodman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Oppose] the power given to potential developers to overrule current homeowners with no power to veto.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 9
1876	S485.001	Rose Biss and Jack Andrew	Mapping	Oppose	Delete the Medium Density Residential Zone from the Tahunanui Hills.	Medium density housing is best located firstly in hazard free areas and secondly where infrastructure services with sufficient capacity are in place. Infrastructure includes roading, stormwater, wastewater and water supply The roads serving this part of Tahunanui are too narrow and have poor sightlines. They are unsuitable for the increased traffic that will be generated by medium density housing, especially if no onsite parking is required for these houses. Unfortunately there is no longer any public transport on this part of the hills. The public bus service was withdrawn after the August 2022 landslips and no longer comes through the proposed new zones. Existing stormwater and wastewater systems on the Tahunanui Hills are not designed for higher density housing. In recent years we have seen stormwater overflowing during high intensity rainfall events into properties along Tahunanui Drive and Tosswill Road. Instability affects a band of land (old sea cliff) through the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone. The August 2022 rainfall event caused slipping along Tosswill Road, Chamberlain St and in the Tosswill Reserve. The slipping was significant enough to cause road closure. Denser housing development is likely to result in more land disturbance as building platforms are cut and retaining walls erected for these multi unit housing projects. The proposed new height limits (12m for MDR) and steeper daylight angles are too high. There are limited open space requirements and yards are too small. These new rules are likely to cause overlooking, loss of privacy and lack of daylight. The Section 32 report while long and detailed does not adequately explain why Medium Density Residential zoning is the most effective and efficient zoning policy for our area on the	Accept in part	Section 12

1877	FS61.073	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Medium density housing is best located firstly in hazard free areas and secondly where infrastructure services with sufficient capacity are in place. Infrastructure includes roading, stormwater, wastewater and water supply. There has been insufficient consultation for such a major change in housing density in this part of Nelson's residential area. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Again shows need for better communication and a community led plan.	Accept in part	Section 12
1878	FS72.077	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Medium density housing is best located firstly in hazard free areas and secondly where infrastructure services with sufficient capacity are in place. Infrastructure includes roading, stormwater, wastewater and water supply. There has been insufficient consultation for such a major change in housing density in this part of Nelson's residential area. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Again shows need for better communication and a community led plan.	Accept in part	Section 12
1879	FS60.069	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Medium density housing is best located firstly in hazard free areas and secondly where infrastructure services with sufficient capacity are in place. Infrastructure includes roading, stormwater, wastewater and water supply. There has been insufficient consultation for such a major change in housing density in this part of Nelson's residential area. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Again shows need for better communication and a community led plan.	Accept in part	Section 12
1880	S485.002	Rose Biss and Jack Andrew	Mapping	Oppose	Delete the High Density Residential Zone from the Tahunanui Hills.	High density housing is best located firstly in hazard free areas and secondly where infrastructure services with sufficient capacity are in place. Infrastructure includes roading, stormwater, wastewater and water supply. The roads serving this part of Tahunanui are too narrow and have poor sightlines. They are unsuitable for the increased traffic that will be generated by high density housing, especially if no onsite parking is required for these houses. unfortunately there is no longer any public transport on this part of the hills. The local bus service was withdrawn after the August 2022 storm event and no longer comes through the proposed new zone. Existing stormwater and wastewater systems on the Tahunanui Hillls are not designed for high density housing. In recent years we have seen stormwater overflowing through properties along Tahunanui Drive and in Tosswill Rd. Instability affects a band of land (old sea cliff) through the High Density Residential Zone. The August 2022 rainfall event caused land slipping along Tosswill Rd, Chamberlain St and in the Tosswill Reserve. The slipping was significant enough to cause road closure. Denser housing is likely to result in more land disturbance as buildng platforms are cut and retaining walls erected for these multi unit housing developments. The proposed new height limit (19m for HDR) and steeper daylight angles are too high. There are very limited open space requirements and yards are too small. These new rules are likely to cause overlooking, loss of privacy and lack of daylight. The Section 32 report, while long and detailed does not adequately explain why High Density Residential zoning is the most effective and efficient zoning policy for our area on the Tahunanui Hills. There has been insufficient consultation for such a	Accept	Section 12

1881	S486.001	Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus)	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the main objective of Plan Change 29 to "amend the Nelson Regional Management Plan (NRMP) to implement the NPS-UD by supporting housing delivery and the provision of well functioning urban environments within Nelson while ensuring that natural hazard risks are appropriately managed and historic heritage is protected."	Telecommunications infrastructure is significant and essential to modern society, and the safe, reliable and efficient functioning of telecommunication networks is vital for the national, regional and local economy and is in the public interest both in terms of allowing people and communities to provide for their "wellbeing", and also for assisting to ensure their "health and safety". The companies support strategies and planning to intensify and better use existing urban environments as appropriate, and support the objective of Plan Change 29.	Accept in part	Section 11
1882	S487.001	Connexa Limited (Connexa)	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the main objective of Plan Change 29 to "amend the Nelson Regional Management Plan (NRMP) to implement the NPS-UD by supporting housing delivery and the provision of well functioning urban environments within Nelson while ensuring that natural hazard risks are appropriately managed and historic heritage is protected."	Telecommunications infrastructure is significant and essential to modern society, and the safe, reliable and efficient functioning of telecommunication networks is vital for the national, regional and local economy and is in the public interest both in terms of allowing people and communities to provide for their "wellbeing", and also for assisting to ensure their "health and safety". The companies support strategies and planning to intensify and better use existing urban environments as appropriate, and support the objective of Plan Change 29.	Accept in part	Section 11
1883	S488.001	Aotearoa Tower Group Limited (trading as FortySouth)	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the main objective of Plan Change 29 to "amend the Nelson Regional Management Plan (NRMP) to implement the NPS-UD by supporting housing delivery and the provision of well functioning urban environments within Nelson while ensuring that natural hazard risks are appropriately managed and historic heritage is protected."	Telecommunications infrastructure is significant and essential to modern society, and the safe, reliable and efficient functioning of telecommunication networks is vital for the national, regional and local economy and is in the public interest both in terms of allowing people and communities to provide for their "wellbeing", and also for assisting to ensure their "health and safety". The companies support strategies and planning to intensify and better use existing urban environments as appropriate, and support the objective of Plan Change 29.	Accept in part	Section 11
1884	S489.002	Michael de Vigne	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Propose alternative rules for the Medium Density Residential zone as follows:	In Nelson there is a need for smaller, warmer, low maintenance, single storey homes for people starting out and for people looking to downsize. Many people who would like to downsize hang on in their larger properties due to lack of suitable small properties on the market. Under new rules large properties could be subdivided or property owners could be allowed to build additional houses on their properties. An example of a small property would be a property with a section size of 200 m² or less. This would allow for a 80m² two bedroom house (or semi-detached) with a 40 m² North facing garden and a single garage and carport on the South side of the house. The remaining land could be used for a shared driveway. People subdividing would have options such as selling the smaller sections or houses to pay off debt or supplement their retirement. They could also provide accommodation for family members. It would be a win for many more people including existing home owners. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
1885	S490.001	One New Zealand Limited (One NZ)	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the main objective of Plan Change 29 to "amend the Nelson Regional Management Plan (NRMP) to implement the NPS-UD by supporting housing delivery and the provision of well functioning urban environments within Nelson while ensuring that natural hazard risks are appropriately managed and historic heritage is protected."	Telecommunications infrastructure is significant and essential to modern society, and the safe, reliable and efficient functioning of telecommunication networks is vital for the national, regional and local economy and is in the public interest both in terms of allowing people and communities to provide for their "wellbeing", and also for assisting to ensure their "health and safety". The companies support strategies and planning to intensify and better use existing urban environments as appropriate, and support the objective of Plan Change 29.	Accept in part	Section 11

1886	S491.001	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark)	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the main objective of Plan Change 29 to "amend the Nelson Regional Management Plan (NRMP) to implement the NPS-UD by supporting housing delivery and the provision of well functioning urban environments within Nelson while ensuring that natural hazard risks are appropriately managed and historic heritage is protected."	Telecommunications infrastructure is significant and essential to modern society, and the safe, reliable and efficient functioning of telecommunication networks is vital for the national, regional and local economy and is in the public interest both in terms of allowing people and communities to provide for their "wellbeing", and also for assisting to ensure their "health and safety". The companies support strategies and planning to intensify and better use existing urban environments as appropriate, and support the objective of Plan Change 29.	Accept in part	Section 11
1887	S492.001	Jonathan Chambers and Louisa Stoneham	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw Plan Change 29.	We believe the proposed PC29 should be fully withdrawn, and that the Council should go back to the drawing board', particularly with respect to the strategy of intensification. We believe PC29 should never have been presented to the public in its current form because the assessment of environmental, social and cultural impact, and evaluation of alternatives, was inadequate ('broad brush' in the Council's own words). We believe the impact on the community has already been unacceptably large - in terms of both the level of stress and concern it has created, and the demand on energy and time it has required of residents to understand potential impacts and prepare submissions. Our confidence in the Council has been severely shaken and we believe this can only be remedied with a full withdrawal of PC29. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
1888	S492.002	Jonathan Chambers and Louisa Stoneham	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seeks] Council adopts a policy to notify directly, in writing, all ratepayers whomay be affected by a future proposed plan change.	There has been inadequate attempt by the Council to engage with the local community in developing the proposed PC29. This is evidenced by the very large number of concerned residents who have attended the public meetings. Noting also that the public meetings only occurred because of strong public reaction to the initial notification of PC29 - the Council, it seems, was hoping to get away without any such engagement. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1889	S492.003	Jonathan Chambers and Louisa Stoneham	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Requests] the 'broad brush' philosophy encapsulated in PC29 is discarded in favour of a much more nuanced approach, capable of engaging with, understanding, and respecting, the values of established neighbourhoods and communities.	There has been zero consideration of the actual social and environmental costs associated with intensification, and inadequate consideration of nuanced alternatives. Rather, the analysis is characterised throughout by a flawed circular logic that 'Intensification is the best option, therefore it maximises all benefits and minimises all costs'. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
1890	S492.004	Jonathan Chambers and Louisa Stoneham	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seeks that] In the medium term (15-30 years), the Council focus its intensification efforts on facilitating development of the largely underdeveloped CBD and existing city fringe / mixed use zones.	Therefore, we firmly request that the Council withdraws its proposal to intensify existing residential neighbourhoods. Instead, Council should reduce its growth expectations to a more moderate level, in keeping with the character of Nelson, and refocus its efforts on improving feasibility of new, residential development within the underdeveloped CBD, existing city fringe / mixed use zones, and other carefully selected sites where impact on neighbourhoods is tolerable. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
1891	S492.005	Jonathan Chambers and Louisa Stoneham	Residential Zones	Oppose	That the proposed HRZ zones be deleted.	We hold there is no place for three-to-six storey development in Nelson's residential suburbs, regardless of predicted levels of regional growth demand. The impact on equitable daylight access of established properties is alone untenable. The sun's path has not changed. An arbitrary alteration of recession planes in the name of 'intensification' will introduce a major disharmony to Nelson, and irreparably alter the feel of the city, and quality of life of residents with established homes. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12

1892	S492.006	Jonathan Chambers and Louisa Stoneham	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Growth expectations for Nelson be moderated by reasonable expectations of the level of intensification that its neighbourhoods and communities can tolerate.	Residents should not be forced to hand over their long-standing access to the valuable natural resource of direct sunlight so that it can be reallocated to developers, to make intensification 'feasible'.	Reject	Section 10
1893	S493.001	Jenni Komarovsky	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consult with ratepayers on Plan Change 29 and produce a better thought out design to a more granular level.	- The city needs to be designed for retrofitting changes in the same way that subdivisions are designed i.e. at a very granular level, otherwise there is no cohesion, transparency or certainty. - The current plan could leave people in a one-storey home being surrounded by tall buildings that remove all of their quality of life in terms of light, warmth and privacy. - Six metres in the suburbs would create buildings that similarly dominate the skyline and create microclimates of shade and wind that would alter the small-town beauty of Nelson. - Skylines and other natural landmarks should be preserved for people to look out on for a feeling of being close to a natural environment. - A city that feels right is one where the centre of town has high buildings and high density occupation, gradually going down in height and density towards the outer suburbs. The proposed plan doesn't have a large enough centred approach. - The two density areas in the North Road / Atawhai Drive area and the slice of land between them is puzzling. There is no difference in risk from water and land settlement between one side of the road and the other. - to maintain character, Nelson should go down the path of allowing more dwellings on one title. - Present future ideas in much simpler visual bites that will enable full democracy. - Richmond isn't a separate city and Nelson doesn't exist in isolation - please work cooperatively with the other council and present the full story.	Reject	Section 13
1894	S494.001	Robert Burton	Mapping	Oppose	Delete High Density Residential Zone and apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district, 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.	I strongly oppose the High-Density Residential Zone, which is an ill-considered and bizarrely insensitive response to questionable assumptions about population growth, and which will have the potential to seriously damage the character and quality of Nelson's residential neighbourhoods. While I have no problem with intensification (and would encourage the Council to make this easier), giving developers free rein to build six-story buildings in a high-density residential zone is an appalling perversion of good town planning. Not only is it in no way in keepng with the low-rise character of so much of the affected areas, but the daylight loss that this will create is simply not acceptable. In my case, with a property in Trafalgar Square west, the area between my property and Nile Street west would seem ripe for a high-rise development. If this happened I would lose significant daylight with the subsequent reduction of quality of life, the character of the entire neighbourhood (including South Street) would be compromised, and the value of my property would plunge.	Accept in part	Section 12
1895	FS65.270	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Delete High Density Residential Zone and apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district [...will have the potential to seriously damage the character and quality of Nelson's residential neighbourhoods.] 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.	Accept in part	Section 12

1896	S495.001	New Zealand Institute of Architects	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the intent of the proposed Plan Change 29 (PC29) to intensify housing supply in and around our primary urban areas.	In general, we support the intent of the proposed Plan Change 29 (PC29) to intensify housing supply in and around our primary urban areas. For too long Nelson has relied upon a growth strategy that is predicated upon single detached dwellings on the fringes of the city at the neglect of our urban areas, and PC29 makes the right moves towards rectifying that. Intensifying our existing urban areas will create more housing choices, allow people to live closer to where they work and socialise, revitalise the central city, reduce our reliance on cars and allow for more efficient infrastructure investment.	Accept in part	Section 12
1897	FS18.003	Rodney Albertyn, Principal Planner, NZ Transport Agency		Support	Accept	NZTA supports the intent of the proposed Plan Change 29 (PC29) to intensify housing supply in and around primary urban areas. NZTA considers that well-planned intensification of existing urban areas will create more housing choices, allow people to live closer to where they work and socialise, reduce reliance on cars and allow for more efficient infrastructure investment.	Accept	Section 12
1898	S495.002	New Zealand Institute of Architects	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Undertake block and neighbourhood level spatial planning to assess the type of development which is most suited to various parts of the urban areas.	We believe that an important step in the plan change process, the development of block and neighbourhood level spatial plans, has been missed. This is a critical component of designing for intensification and was a prerequisite within the FDS 2022-52 prior to undertaking an intensification plan change. Nelson's settlement pattern has created a hugely diverse range of urban conditions, with a wide variety of block sizes, topographical constraints, view shafts and orientations. It is difficult to have a 'one size fits all' approach to the planning rules when there is such a variety of different conditions, even within a single neighbourhood. Having a robust understanding of the specific requirements for each block and neighbourhood will allow for more tailored design and planning guidance. ...Without a spatial plan, the design of our neighbourhoods will be an ad-hoc process, unsupported by necessary infrastructure planning and left open to site by site aspirations of developers. We recommend that spatial planning be undertaken as a priority... n an incremental basis, tackling the low hanging fruit first by targeting areas where intensification is most needed and appropriate, and then releasing location specific plan changes as each spatial design is completed... [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 9
1899	FS39.002	Richard Harden and Rachel Reese		Support	Accept	The approach promoted by this submitter is sound and appropriate. Plan Change 29 is out of step with the Nelson Tasman FDS 2022's clear direction on the importance of spatial and neighbourhood planning. The Hearings Panel that made recommendations to Nelson City Council and Tasman District Council emphasised these matters as a priority. The Councils later accepted the Hearing Panel's recommendations by resolution. There is no record of the FDS resolutions being revoked. The commissioners for Plan Change 29 should familiarise themselves with the FDS evidence, decisions, and video recordings of the FDS Hearings which adjourned specifically to address these matters on its final day of deliberations. The video recordings are on public record at Tasman District Council. The Panel was clear that spatial and neighbourhood planning were essential components of any future plan change processes. The FDS Hearings Panel never contemplated the blanket approach with regard to density and height that Plan Change 29 is promoting. If the draft FDS wording was not amended to record these very clear directions, recommendations and then resolutions, then the FDS contains a drafting error that should not be relied on.	Reject	Section 13

1900	FS56.059	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Neighbourhood spatial plans are a lower order document and, on this basis should not supersede or delay implementation of the rule framework. Neighbourhood plans could be incorporated through non-statutory design guidance for example.	Accept in part	Section 13
1901	FS78.029	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Block and neighbourhood level spatial planning. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13
1902	FS65.271	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: Block and neighbourhood level spatial planning. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
1903	S495.003	New Zealand Institute of Architects	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Engage with the community during the development of the spatial plans and associated plan changes.	There appeared to be a lack of community and industry engagement within the preparation of PC29, which has resulted in the community feeling caught out when it was announced and, understandably, having a strong reaction. We recommend that council commits to direct engagement with the community during the development of the spatial plans and associated plan changes.	Reject	Section 13
1904	S495.005	New Zealand Institute of Architects	Entire Plan Change	Amend	[Amend the residential development standards to require] all developments that require resource consent within the central, medium and high density zones to present their scheme to the Urban Design Panel (UDP) for a qualitative review prior to application for resource consent. Developers/designers will need to respond to the recommendations of the UDP in their resource consent application either through identifying design changes, or by providing a rationale as to why they chose not to accept these recommendations.	An Urban Design Panel (UDP) is a tool that can be utilised to enhance designs and provide guidance prior to being submitted for resource consent. It allows developers to both access expert feedback on their proposal and acts as a body that can review the more qualitative aspects of a development with particular view to the potential risks from intensification. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1905	FS56.061	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora supports the use of an Urban Design Panel (UDP) but notes this is not a matter to be considered as part of this plan change. Requiring all developments to go through this process would introduce consenting burdens and ultimately slow the supply of additional housing. The UDP process if implemented should be reserved for significant development only.	Accept	Section 13

1906	S495.008	New Zealand Institute of Architects	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Encourage comprehensive intensification rather than infill.	A challenge associated with undertaking brownfield intensification, particularly somewhere like Nelson, is that there is a tendency for it to be of a piecemeal, site by site basis. Not only is this an inefficient process, but it can also often result in poor outcomes, such as backyard infill, reduced green space and a lack of coordination of both urban form and infrastructure investment. In contrast, comprehensive (multi-site) intensification can deliver much better built outcomes, providing greater amenity to both the occupants of the new dwellings and their neighbourhoods. Multi-site development can also improve the commercial feasibility for developers. We suggest making modifications to the planning process to encourage comprehensive intensification rather than infill, such as by having dedicated resources within council who are tasked with facilitating and streamlining multi-site consent applications.	Accept in part	Section 12
1907	FS39.001	Richard Harden and Rachel Reese		Support	Accept	I agree with the submission point as this is consistent with neighbourhood planning, good urban planning and sustainable use of a scarce resource (land).	Accept	Section 9
1908	FS56.064	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support	Accept	Kāinga Ora supports in principle the incentivisation of comprehensive redevelopment and a streamlined consenting pathway for this type of development.	Reject	Section 13
1909	S495.009	New Zealand Institute of Architects	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Support a feasibility study on a joint Urban Development Agency (UDA).	A UDA could be a powerful mechanism to develop comprehensive, high quality housing projects. Working with the private sector, a UDA ultimately offers the ability to enact council's spatial neighbourhood plans while maintaining high design and amenity outcomes.	Reject	Section 13
1910	FS56.065	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora would support such a feasibility study but considers this is not a matter to be considered as part of this plan change.	Accept in part	Section 13
1911	S495.016	New Zealand Institute of Architects	Residential Zones	Amend	Increase the supply of reserves and parks, with the aim that houses in intensified areas should be no further than 250m from a park.	The increasing densification within our existing urban areas and the associated reduction in private green space for individual dwellings requires a robust strategy to increase the supply of reserves and parks within Nelson. Ideally, houses in intensified areas should be no further than 250m from a park, which may require council purchasing strategic sites for adaption into park and play areas.	Accept in part	Section 12
1912	S495.017	New Zealand Institute of Architects	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Consider including concessions to projects with low carbon or high sustainability goals, such as increased height or increased site coverage.	Consideration may be given to including concessions to projects with low carbon or high sustainability goals, such as increased height or increased site coverage, to incentivise projects which are in line with our long-term sustainability goals.	Accept in part	Section 13
1913	S496.001	Alan York	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	The proposal [PC29] should be withdrawn so that Council Planning staff can refine and complete it beforere-submitting it to rate-payer scrutiny.	In my view the who!e PC 29 consultation process has been lacking in many respects, not the !east being that the changes comprise a huge volume of information which the general public is expected to read, assimilate and respond to, in an extremely short time period. We are not trained/qualified Town Planners. In support of this view, Council Staff have indicated in meetings that "This is a 'Broad Brush approach' that requires public submissions to refine the plan". In effect, admitting that the Plan is incomplete.	Reject	Section 10
1914	S496.002	Alan York	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	The consultation process [for PC29] should include presentations of the plan including maps ofthe affected areas accompanied by simple scale-sized 'models' showing the potential worst-caseimpact on properties built to previous and current standards, for low, medium and high-densityscenarios.	It is incumbent on the Council to ensure that all residents are aware of these planned and very significant far-reaching changes to their city. Entries in the local newspapers, alone, aren't adequate since many people simply do not read them I suggest bill-boards, signs and 'adverts' on local busses be used prior to an during the submission period.	Reject	Section 13

1915	S496.003	Alan York	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Requests] The plan is revised to account for the errors in the popoulation growth predictions used.	It appears that the forecasts used by NCC are higher than the Statistics NZ Medium projections, which will undoubtedly indicate a need for higher density accommodation than a more modest basis would. Regulations that turn out to be 'over-egged' will result in unnecessary building density and so a carefully phased and managed approach, revised to suit changing conditions, is vital. The statistics NZ medium projections should be used. Notwithstanding the above, it has recently become apparent that there are very considerable errors in the population growth projections used, these errors must of course be corrected and the Plan revised.	Reject	Section 10
1916	S496.004	Alan York	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Oppose] the High Density Residential Zone.	Sunlight is a critical part of life anywhere and in Nelson it 'goes with the territory'. It is known as the 'sunshine capital of NZ' for good reason and this is why people wish to live here. According to [Councils] 2021 report on housing preferences, sunshine is the major reason people move to Nelson. High density buildings will substantially reduce the availability of this natural heat/energy saving resource, requiring the use of more fossil-based' energy in direct conflict of the 'low-carbon' economy we are constantly told is necessary. Residential properties must ensure a reasonable level of privacy. Building to within 1m of property boundaries will hardly ensure that! I believe that high density residential zones are totally inappropriate for Nelson and its environments. New green field developments are the obvious and appropriate place for multi-storey buildings and will ensure optimum utalisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.	Reject in part	Section 12
1917	FS32.011	Peter Olorenshaw		Oppose in part	Reject in part	Higher density housing in close in areas is uncontrovertibly the low carbon option. 94% of our carbon footprint in this region is in transport according to Statistics NZ (see Nelsust submission for references, screenshots of this). Allowing more people to live close-in to amenities to their place of work, education and shopping means low carbon transport modes like active and public transport become more viable - bike journeys are shorter, buses can be more frequent in denser populated areas which means they become a more viable option for more people. Conversely forcing new housing to the periphery means extra for infrastructure costs ($ and CO2) now and maintenance into the future as against using existing infrastructure for new houses in the close-in areas. (Replacing an existing 3 or 4 bedroomed house with 3 or 4 or 6, one and two bedroomed units does not have to involve significant extra water supply, stormwater loading or wastewater volume. For a start what is the extra load on 3 waters with two couples living in a house that has been partitioned into two over the family of 5 that used to occupy that house even if they had the same water supply fittings. But modern low flow fittings mean that many more people can use the same volume of water previously used and this results in the same volume of wastewater as previously: Most of these older houses had 12 litre per flush toilets each time the toilet is flushed be it for urine or faeces - there are 4.5/3 litre flush toilets available now, likewise with washing machines - modern front loaders use perhaps 1/3 of traditional top loaders that the old house probably had and aerated taps and shower heads give the feeling of a full shower at much lower water usage. This lower water usage not only means less	Accept in part	Section 12

1918	S496.007	Alan York	Entire Plan Change	Amend	[Suggests] the inner city be the starting place for the most significant intensification, before considering residential neighborhoods.	There are considerable areas in and around the city centre (e.g. Vanguard and St. Vincent Streets), currently occupied by 'light-industrial' enterprises, which would be ideal for multi-unit residential accommodation without impacting existing properties. The council should consider providing incentives to move these enterprises to less essential land in order to provide additional residential accommodation within the city. City fringe areas should be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally the residential areas should be the last area to be considered for intensification. In all cases, intensification should be planned with careful reference to the revised population estimates and lessons learned from previous phases.	Reject	Section 10
1919	S496.010	Alan York	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose PC29 in its entirety.	[Refer to reasons in submission points S482.001 - S482.007 and the original submission].	Reject	Section 9
1920	S497.001	Malachi Ng	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] the council either completely scrap the plan, or to amend it, forcing anyone who wishes to construct a building using this plan, to pay the amount that any affected house has been devalued by, upon the sale of that house, as well as a decently large fee to compensate for the impact that is made on the affected residents quality of life.	The Nelson Region is well known for not just its communities, attractions, and small town, but also for its weather. Nearly always sunny, minimal clouds. According to NIWA, Nelson/Tasman is the sunniest region in NZ. Many people recognise this as one of many reasons to move, or retire here. Plan 29 in its current form would ruin this and more. Plan Change Number 29 is allowing the construction of huge 6 storey buildings in many areas, including my own, all without resource consent. This change would lose many Nelsonians huge amounts of money, without them having any say about it. According to a study by research group Motu, a house's value increases by a whopping 2.4%, for just 1 hour of direct sunlight. Not only the sun, but living right next to 6 stories of people, and the noise, obstruction, traffic and so much more they make will decrease the house's value by even more. The costs for a resident would not just be taken off their house's value, but would also include many sun dependent expenses. For example, with a fraction of the sunlight, residents will have to pay far more for heating, and lighting, raising the power bill significantly. Not only that but houses that rely on solar power would lose their cheap access to electricity, and the investment they made when purchasing solar panels, hoping they would pay themselves off, would go completely to waste. The main reason Plan Change 29 was made, is to bring down housing prices to become affordable for the next generation, so that Nelson will keep its population. If the idea is to try and adapt Nelson to become more like Christchurch, or even Wellington, then the plan will completely backfire. This is because while making houses more affordable, and the city larger is good, Nelson does not have as much to offer as the	Reject	Section 9
1921	S498.001	Nelson Tasman 2050	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Engage in comprehensive spatial planning and the development of integrated urban regeneration plans at a neighbourhood level.	NelsonTasman2050 supports the intention of PC29 to encourage housing intensification in Nelson. However, we are not in favour of the blanket planning rules that are proposed to implement medium and higher density intensification. The current liberal approach of PC29 leaves the resulting built environment outcomes too much to chance. It is highly likely that the uncoordinated urban form will be disappointing, leading to negative associations with urban living and thereby shoring up demand for greenfield expansion as an unintended consequence. Well-designed intensification requires the proactive consideration of specific neighbourhood conditions to inform integrated urban regeneration spatial plans. These plans should form the basis for identifying parameters that ensure that each site development complements the spatial vision. {Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
1922	FS78.030	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Comprehensive spatial planning and the development of integrated urban regeneration plans at a neighbourhood level. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13

1923	FS65.309	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Comprehensive spatial planning and the development of integrated urban regeneration plans at a neighbourhood level. 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 in part	Section 12
1924	S498.002	Nelson Tasman 2050	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Provide for more housing (including smaller units) and activity in central, well-connected parts of the city.	We fully agree with the intention of PC29 to encourage housing intensification. It is critical for Nelson to provide for more housing (including smaller units) and activity in central, well-connected parts of the city to enable mode shift, to bring vitality back into the centre, to reduce pressure for urban sprawl, retain productive and natural land, build resilience and to lower our collective carbon footprint and consumption of natural resources.	Accept in part	Section 12
1925	S498.003	Nelson Tasman 2050	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Design comprehensive neighbourhood plans first, for all medium and high density zones as well as the central zones, with a design-led approach to consider individual site or block conditions such as location, aspect, topography, access to services and amenities, overland flow paths, flood protection and watercourses, infrastructure, significant trees and vegetation, heritage items and commercial aspects like land value vs. capitalisation etc.	Neighbourhood plans give some certainty about the form and location of future buildings, open space areas for outlook and privacy, future public and private green spaces, play areas, potential new laneways and so on. Our current FDS spells out the need for such neighbourhood plans already. Only once a shared plan or vision is agreed with the community should we set the rules (e.g. for permitted activities) and assessment criteria that will enable this vision to become reality [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 13
1926	FS78.287	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Design neighbourhood plans including heritage items. 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.	Accept in part	Section 13
1927	FS65.310	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Design neighbourhood plans including heritage items. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12

1928	S498.008	Nelson Tasman 2050	Entire Plan Change	Amend	[Amend the residential development standards to require] all developments that require resource consent within the central, medium and high density zones to present their scheme to the UDP for a qualitative review prior to application for resource consent. Developers/designers will need to respond to the recommendations of the UDP in their resource consent application either through identifying design changes, or by providing a rationale as to why they chose not to accept these recommendations.	An Urban Design Panel (UDP) is a tool that can be utilised to enhance designs and provide guidance prior to being submitted for resource consent. It allows developers to both access expert feedback on their proposal and acts as a body that can review the more qualitative aspects of a development with particular view to the potential risks from intensification. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1929	S498.009	Nelson Tasman 2050	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Make modifications to PC29 to encourage comprehensive intensification akin to Auckland's Unitary Plan and have dedicated staff resources who are tasked with facilitating and streamlining multi-site consent applications.	A challenge associated with undertaking brownfield intensification, particularly somewhere like Nelson, is that there is a tendency for this to happen "piecemeal", site by site. Not only is this an inefficient process, but it can also often result in poor outcomes, such as backyard infill, reduced green space and a lack of coordination of both urban form and infrastructure investment. In contrast, comprehensive (multi-site) intensification can deliver much better built outcomes, providing greater amenity to both the occupants of the new dwellings and their neighbourhoods. Multi-site development can also improve the commercial feasibility for developers. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 9
1930	FS56.071	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support	Accept	Kāinga Ora supports in principle the incentivisation of comprehensive redevelopment and a streamlined consenting pathway for this type of development.	Reject	Section 13
1931	S498.010	Nelson Tasman 2050	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Support a feasibility study on a joint Urban Development Agency (UDA).	A UDA could be a powerful mechanism to develop comprehensive, high quality housing projects. Working with the private sector, a UDA ultimately offers the ability to enact council's spatial neighbourhood plans while maintaining high design and amenity outcomes.	Accept	Section 13
1932	S498.012	Nelson Tasman 2050	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Incentivise projects with low carbon or high sustainability outcomes through a reduction of fees and development contributions, prioritised processing and/or through targeted subsidies e.g. for on-site energy generation or water management (permeable surfaces, rain gardens etc.).	Refer to reasons in submission point S498.011.	Accept in part	Section 13

1933	S499.001	Alexandra Mary Teague & Grant Leonard RussellAlexandra Teague	Mapping	Oppose	[Rezone] the Tahunanui hills area from the proposed High DensityResidential Zone and to the General Residential Zone.	The principle reasons for this request include slope instability, inadequate infrastructure, lack of amenities, and destruction of amenity values: - Geotechnical data must be considered when determining zoning rules for the Tahunanui hills area, which has a well-documented established and recent history of, and ongoing potential for, significant natural hazard through slope instability. - Stormwater infrastructure is already stretched to its limits during heavy rain and it would not cope with intensification. - Reports by Beca in 2021 and 2022 highlight the elevated risk of future slope instability in the Tahunanui hills. - The steep terrain of the Tahunanui hills means that access to shops and the school across the busy state highway, via often slippery steps, is impossible for wheelchairs, bicycles and prams. There is no supermarket within walking distance of the area. - Intensification on the Tahunanui hills will deny this basic human right [access to sunlight and daylight] to existing residents adjacent to developments as well as to new residents. Property values (and ultimately capital values and rates) will plummet where sunlight and views are lost. Desirable areas will be no longer be desirable. Homes, gardens and streets will become damp and mouldy. - Proposed intensification would irreparably transform this environmental amenity [visual and recreational amenity], enjoyed regularly by Tahunanui locals, Nelsonians and tourists. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1934	FS61.074	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The principle reasons for this request include slope instability, inadequate infrastructure, lack of amenities, and destruction of amenity values. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- The principle reasons for this request include slope instability, inadequate infrastructure, lack of amenities, and destruction of amenity values.	Accept in part	Section 12
1935	FS72.078	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The principle reasons for this request include slope instability, inadequate infrastructure, lack of amenities, and destruction of amenity values. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- The principle reasons for this request include slope instability, inadequate infrastructure, lack of amenities, and destruction of amenity values.	Accept in part	Section 12
1936	FS60.070	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The principle reasons for this request include slope instability, inadequate infrastructure, lack of amenities, and destruction of amenity values. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- The principle reasons for this request include slope instability, inadequate infrastructure, lack of amenities, and destruction of amenity values.	Accept in part	Section 12
1937	S500.001	Euan Laird	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Oppose the NCC PC29 Process].	NCC has the right to challenge central govt and question the manner, intent and interpretation of such law, and certainly the timing of its implementation. NCC breached the rules relating to Local Govt enactment in the manner in which it drew up and then promulgated PC29. There is an opacity in the NCC in relation to where each councilor sits on the matter of PC29. The initial time frame for NCC to receive submissions before the "panel" met to consider the final PC29 plan was woefully inadequate -- the Nelson Resource Management Plan (NMRP)was operative on the 1st of September, 2023 and we were given only until the 19th September, 2023. [Refer to points 1 - 4 in the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

1938	S500.002	Euan Laird	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Suggests council implement an Urban Advisory Panel (UAP)].	[An UAP] would survey and audit the Nelson CBD. Commercial, retail, hospitality, residential, vacant spaces, buildings in need of earthquake proofing, car parking and pedestrian pathways, public transport nodes and routes are examples of what such an audit would entail. This could lead to a map of current and future development possibilities, without the statutory overlay of a UDA [Urban Development Authority]. [Refer to point 5 in the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 13
1939	S500.003	Euan Laird	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Oppose the make up of the hearing panel].	NCC has seriously erred here in this fraught process. The "panel" should be expanded to at least five [people] with perhaps an architect and maybe a developer added to it. If the "panel" is left as it is, it will in my opinion be a rank article of local body partisan politics that is both undemocratic and not how Kiwis expect matters to be run. NCC needs to sort this out, urgently. [Refer to point 6 in the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1940	S500.004	Euan Laird	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Suggests] that a UAP conducts an audit [on Nelson city's expected population growth in the next ten years].	Nelson city has an expected population growth of 3500 in the next ten years [which equals a] 350 increase per year. The Reserve Bank of New Zealand panel data regression techniques estimates that 0.25 -- 0.30 additional houses are built for every additional person in a region. Given 350 x 0.3 = 105 is the number of new dwellings required across the whole of Nelson city in each year of the 10 year aliquot. There are 17,238 occupied dwellings and 1185 unoccupied dwellings in Nelson city (https://statsnz.contentdm.oclc.org). My proposal that a UAP conducts an audit as above would probably find these figures to be in the right ballpark. The figure of 1185 unoccupied dwellings needs serious consideration and may well reveal that Nelson is definitely not in need of the planned for intensification. Such figures certainly negate the need for intensification on the widespread scale that PC29 envisages, and certainly not with the rapidity of action that NCC has laid out in its PC29 schedule. So, why the rush, and where is the justification?	Accept in part	Section 13
1941	S500.006	Euan Laird	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Oppose the HDRZ].	The scale of the HDRZ is too big and spread out for a city of our size. Ideally, and in conjunction with my proposed UAP audit, it would be contained within the borders of Halifax, Rutherford, Selwyn and Collingwood in the first instance. When, and only after this area has been demonstrated to be insufficient for the planned intensification demand, should it be expanded outwards, but only on an incremental basis, justified by the demographic increase and demand. As above I do not believe that the figures currently justify this demand, and certainly not to the boundaries of the current PC29 plan.	Reject in part	Section 12
1942	S500.007	Euan Laird	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Proposethat the CBD defined by Halifax, Rutherford, Selwyn and Collingwoodprecinct is sufficient for HDRZ buildings, and that should be its limit. MDRZcould then be perhaps extended out from the CBD as above, incrementally andas and when demand predicates such an outward expansion and ending at thecurrent PC29 HDRZ boundary.	If we accept a degree of intensification then the planned HDRZ for the CBD is one with the least impact in terms of architecture, aesthetics and higher rise buildings, given that much of the HDRZ will lie within the CBD which is already littered with many higher rise buildings. There should be no further need for intensification beyond this boundary, subject to a builder/ developer/ resident wishing to build say a two storey building in this outer zone, but in accord with appropriate RMA regulations. This retains the character of the vast majority of Nelson city, avoids endless litigation and stress over the NIMBY argument that is now rife within Nelson city, and yet will easily meet the dwelling demand for the projected population increase.	Reject	Section 12

1943	S500.009	Euan Laird	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Oppose PC29].	One of the great unknowns of PC29 is the cost of such intensification. "Affordability" is touted as being a hallmark of such intensification. This is a fallacious myth. Building costs are skyrocketing, we live within a very constrained cost of living crisis economy and the potential "affordablebracket buyers" of such intensified development are probably already priced out of the market. Private developers are not going to intensify unless they are satisfied such development will meet commercial returns. Hence they may well build incorporating parking off street2 in their developments, but this will only inflate the sale or rental income returns. Affordability then becomes a major issue. This leads into the rental sector of such intensification and one that papakainga and its counterparts will no doubt play a large role. This may well occur given that the central govt chequebook behind such development does not seem to need to meet the normal prudent investor criteria that a develop would follow. Such development then leads into "ghettoised" areas with all of the corollaries such as vehicle congestion, overcrowding, possible crime and anti-social behaviour. Is this what PC29 envisaged?	Reject	Section 9
1944	S500.010	Euan Laird	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Oppose PC29].	PC29 lays out the intensification process that can occur if a planned intensification build meets all of the RMA strictures. It states that a publicly notified consent application does not need to occur in such circumstances. This is far beyond undemocratic and gives the average resident whose home/residence may be encroached upon by a higher rise building with no warning as to when such a build could occur. If nothing else it is imperative that publicly notified consents should be the absolute standard for all such development to occur. This is the absolute standard in the city of Melbourne, Australia. To the planners, councillors and naysayers who say this is too bureaucratic, I would say revisit the consents process, streamline and simplify, stop the eye watering, price gouging fees associated with consents and listen to your constituents.	Reject	Section 9
1945	S500.011	Euan Laird	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Oppose PC29].	It is indeed ironic that PC29 has at its heart planning, yet allows a scatter gun approach to development due to too wide a geography of each of the Residential Zones. Thus neighbourhood character and ambience could go out with the bathwater when a six storey build occurs smack within a street of single storey residential buildings, along with street congestion due to haphazard vehicle parking, wheelie bin (rubbish, recycling, green waste) placement, as the new build does not allow for off street car parking. The report by Market Economics, May, 2023, Appendix IG specifically addresses these and related issues. "Under the proposed provisions the total capacity of PC29 amounts to five to nine times the level of long term demand."	Reject	Section 13
1946	S501.001	Jade McFarlane	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Ensure that] intensification is accompanied by comprehensive spatial plans prior to being implemented.	Additional points I make to NelsonTasman2050 is the need to hold workshops with various neighbourhoods key stakeholders and urban design experts across the city and determine whether those specific communities are after preservation, restoration or regeneration - as all three have different approaches to intensification. This model of identifying precinct type and having community led outcomes is critical to success - as there is no one fits all approach however having the 3 categories above and building an approach for each would be a smart way to progress. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
1947	FS78.031	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Comprehensive spatial plans. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13

1948	FS65.311	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Comprehensive spatial plans. 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 13
1949	S502.001	Carina Thomas-Beech	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	I implore this council to go back to consultation with residents, qualified planners, design consultants, and town planning experts.	I believe that this PLAN CHANGE has not been given enough thought, residences were not consulted before the PLAN CHANGE was announced. I would not want my home surrounded by high rise buildings as I would no longer have any view or sun. I purchased my home, with my late husband, in 1987, we bought our forever home. A home with a history, built in 1931/32, from 2 Rimu trees; a wedding gift to the Wilsons. My home will be 100 years old in a few short years, and to imagine it being built in, or pulled down, is heartbreaking for me and my family. I believe that there are alternative solutions to the urban sprawl of Nelson. I am not sure what these solutions are, but many have been put forward by others interested in this submission.	Reject	Section 13
1950	S503.001	Susan Capenerhurst	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29 in its entirety.	This is a far-reaching plan as stated by the mayor. Its immediate impact on us personally was an increase in stress given that it becomes possible for the development of a high rise type of building next door/in the neighbourhood with no consultation. The Future Development Strategy spells out the need for neighbourhood plans before an intensification policy is cemented in place. This plan 29 seems to ignore that (amongst other things) but has picked out some support from within the strategy for high rise buildings as a stand alone solution. It is our belief that council has seemed to ignore the well being of its citizens by its current plan proposal. A common theme at the meetings I attended was the stress this has caused. I cannot understand how Council could not realise the potential impact on the community that this plan in its current form has engendered. I believe this plan is too narrow in scope and ignores the wider definitions of environment as defined in the current RMA - which includes people and communities.	Reject	Section 9
1951	FS5.023	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 9
1952	FS83.113	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1953	S503.002	Susan Capenerhurst	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions. Or preferably re-think the approach and consider far more comprehensive neighbourhood plans and consultation.	It has been stated at numerous meetings "This is a 'Broad Brush approach' that requires public submissions to refine the plan". Such a statement implies PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can redesign it.	Reject	Section 13
1954	FS83.114	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1955	S503.004	Susan Capenerhurst	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Support intensification and oppose the endless green fields development which has characterised expansion.	I support intensification and oppose the endless green fields development which has characterised expansion but strongly believe that planning is essential to prevent a hotch potch approach. Nelson is a 'Low Rise' City with a collection of heritage and non-heritage character buildings that have attracted people for generations.	Accept in part	Section 13
1956	FS83.116	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12

1957	S503.005	Susan Capenerhurst	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider progressively phasing in intensification e.g. the inner city, which is perhaps the most obvious place to start where 6 storey buildings may not look totally out of place.	Potentially developing the inner city first will 'mop up' anticipated demand (and there appears to be some question mark over predicted figures based on Council figures/predictions) - possibly for some decades to come. This has a benefit that it will give far more time for a cohesive and well thought out plan (neighbourhood plans) which identifies other suitable areas - with city fringe areas being the next obvious target area(s). There are lots of ideas out there - encourage car yards to move, develop the army yard. I want to see Council be prepared to use the expertise of urban planners and architects to come up with innovative and attractive solutions.	Reject	Section 10
1958	FS83.117	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1959	S503.006	Susan Capenerhurst	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose the current high and medium density zones and remove HDRZ from the plan completely (perhaps with the central city as an exception).	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.	Accept in part	Section 12
1960	FS83.118	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1961	S503.007	Susan Capenerhurst	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Council to appoint Councilors from either side of the Sept 14th vote [to the Hearing Panel] and if not, that all Councilors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	I strongly disagree with the make-up of the hearing panel, because of its 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councilor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
1962	FS83.119	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1963	S503.008	Susan Capenerhurst	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Support an over-arching Urban Development Agency which identifies suitable areas for intensification and which has a long term view.	Council needs to lead the way in showing a long term development plan into which developers fit rather than letting developers have their head. Areas for development need to be identified on an urban block by block approach and then that information needs to be communicated to residents of Nelson.	Accept	Section 13
1964	FS83.120	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1965	S503.009	Susan Capenerhurst	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district, 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.	Refer to the reasons in S503.006.	Reject	Section 12
1966	FS28.117	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district; 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 in part	Section 12
1967	FS83.121	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12

1968	S504.001	Richard Capenerhurst	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29 in its entirety.	This is a far-reaching plan as stated by the mayor. Its immediate impact on us personally was an increase in stress given that it becomes possible for the development of a high rise type of building next door/in the neighbourhood with no consultation. The Future Development Strategy spells out the need for neighbourhood plans before an intensification policy is cemented in place. This plan 29 seems to ignore that (amongst other things) but has picked out some support from within the strategy for high rise buildings as a stand alone solution. It is my belief that council has seemed to ignore the well being of its citizens by its current plan proposal. A common theme at the meetings I attended was the stress this has caused. I cannot understand how Council could not realise the potential impact on the community that this plan in its current form has engendered. I believe this plan is too narrow in scope and ignores the wider definitions of environment as defined in the current RMA - which includes people and communities.	Reject	Section 9
1969	FS83.122	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1970	S504.002	Richard Capenerhurst	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions. Or preferably re-think the approach and consider far more comprehensive neighbourhood plans and consultation.	It has been stated at numerous meetings "This is a 'Broad Brush approach' that requires public submissions to refine the plan". Such a statement implies PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can redesign it.	Reject	Section 13
1971	FS83.123	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1972	S504.004	Richard Capenerhurst	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Support intensification and oppose the endless green fields development which has characterised expansion.	I support intensification and oppose the endless green fields development which has characterised expansion but strongly believe that planning is essential to prevent a hotch potch approach. Nelson is a 'Low Rise' City with a collection of heritage and non heritage character buildings that have attracted people for generations.	Accept in part	Section 13
1973	FS83.125	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1974	S504.005	Richard Capenerhurst	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Support an over-arching Urban Development Agency which identifies suitable areas for intensification and which has a long term view.	Council needs to lead the way in showing a long term development plan into which developers fit rather than letting developers have their head. Areas for development need to be identified on an urban block by block approach and then that information needs to be communicated to residents of Nelson.	Accept	Section 13
1975	FS83.126	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1976	S504.006	Richard Capenerhurst	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Oppose the current high and medium density zones and remove HDRZ from the plan completely (perhaps with the central city as an exception).	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.	Accept	Section 12
1977	FS83.127	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1978	S504.007	Richard Capenerhurst	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district, 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.	Refer to the reasons in S504.006.	Reject	Section 12
1979	FS83.128	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12

1980	S504.008	Richard Capenerhurst	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider progressively phasing in intensification e.g. the inner city, which is perhaps the most obvious place to start where 6 storey buildings may not look totally out of place.	Potentially developing the inner city first will 'mop up' anticipated demand (and there appears to be some question mark over predicted figures based on Council figures/predictions) - possibly for some decades to come. This has a benefit that it will give far more time for a cohesive and well thought out plan (neighbourhood plans) which identifies other suitable areas - with city fringe areas being the next obvious target area(s). There are lots of ideas out there - encourage car yards to move, develop the army yard. I want to see Council be prepared to use the expertise of urban planners and architects to come up with innovative and attractive solutions.	Reject	Section 10
1981	FS83.129	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
1982	S505.001	Stuart and Sally Hanchet	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the proposed HDZ in residential areas where there is no walkable access toamenities (supermarkets, schools and public transport) as well where there is a risk ofincreasing natural hazards (e.g. floods and land instability).	Not stated.	Accept	Section 12
1983	S505.003	Stuart and Sally Hanchet	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Seek council] remove Tahunanui Hills from theproposed HDZ and make it GRZ.	Tahunanui Hills [is subject to] ongoing slope instability, lack of infrastructure, lack of the essential amenities (no supermarkets or public transport) within walking distance, and the increased likelihood of slips directly caused by intensification development and frequent weather events. [Refer to the "Reasons for our opposition to the proposed Tahunanui High Density Zone" section of the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
1984	FS61.043	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Tahunanui Hills [is subject to] ongoing slope instability, lack of infrastructure, lack of the essential amenities (no supermarkets or public transport) within walking distance, and the increased likelihood of slips directly caused by intensification development and frequent weather events. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support - Instability of Tahunanui hills and lack of appropriate infrastructure.	Accept in part	Section 12
1985	FS72.047	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Tahunanui Hills [is subject to] ongoing slope instability, lack of infrastructure, lack of the essential amenities (no supermarkets or public transport) within walking distance, and the increased likelihood of slips directly caused by intensification development and frequent weather events. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support - Instability of Tahunanui hills and lack of appropriate infrastructure.	Accept in part	Section 12
1986	FS60.039	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Tahunanui Hills [is subject to] ongoing slope instability, lack of infrastructure, lack of the essential amenities (no supermarkets or public transport) within walking distance, and the increased likelihood of slips directly caused by intensification development and frequent weather events. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support - Instability of Tahunanui hills and lack of appropriate infrastructure.	Accept in part	Section 12
1987	S505.004	Stuart and Sally Hanchet	Residential Zones	Amend	[Seeks] council to make sure all proposed HDZ have walkable access to asupermarket (not a local diary).	Christchurch planners are only proposing HDZ within 800m of a supermarket.	Reject in part	Section 10
1988	S505.008	Stuart and Sally Hanchet	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seeks] Council withdraw PC29 and have planning staff refine the plan design andfollow the proper procedure of consultation and public engagement.	[Refer to reasons in submission points S505.001 - S505.007].	Reject	Section 13

1989	S505.009	Stuart and Sally Hanchet	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seeks] Council appoint independent hearing commissioners for the plan change.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
1990	S505.010	Stuart and Sally Hanchet	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seeks] Council use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 10
1991	S505.011	Stuart and Sally Hanchet	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Seeks] the Council inform all rate payers individually with emails and letters about any changes to their property zoning and to give each ratepayer the opportunity to respond.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
1992	S507.001	Katrina Kidson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Restrict the high density proposed in [Plan Change 29] to the [Inner City and City Fringe zones].	I support our city increasing in density with more infill, more units and more multi-storey. The present plan change goes too far however. I know that effectively 6 stories will still require consent. However it is hard to imagine these buildings being appropriate anywhere other than the CBD and mixed use areas. I'm not clear on how we manage the effects of a multi-storey building on next to an existing low rise. What is this like for the neighbouring home owners, their enjoyment of their property and their property value.	Accept in part	Section 12
1993	S507.002	Katrina Kidson	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Allow increased density in our residential areas, but not as drastically as presently planned.	The apartments that we have recently had built are a good step towards increasing density in town and I support developments, such as Kaianga Ora building 16 units on the Masonic Lodge Site on Nile St. This is very close to where I live and if it is designed and managed well, this will be a good asset for Nelson. I note that this plan proposes changing the block that I live be rezoned on from Residential to High Density. This is a big change.	Accept in part	Section 12
1994	S508.003	Rachel Sharples	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Consider the following alternatives to the intensification proposed in Plan Change 29]:	Refer to reasons in submission point S508.001. Work on infrustructure. I have heard a lot about water and services but not schools and where these people are going to be educated/work/extra curricular activities.	Reject	Section 11
1995	S509.001	Zanahe Galloway	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Change the inflated and inaccurate number of households projected to be needed.	1. infrastructure cannot support this type of intensification, especially roads limitation in specific Nelson geography. 2. This type of intensification is not contributing to the costs preparations needed for Climate Change on the contrary will create more costs with an increase of population within the city of Nelson. 3. This type of intensification is not viable with the specific geography of Nelson with more land slides, flooding of the Maitai river and coastal ocean rise inundation map already showing the coming reality of our future.	Reject	Section 11
1996	S509.003	Zanahe Galloway	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	{Provide] a much longer period for public review and formulation of submissions than NCC has allowed.	"Plan Change 29 is the biggest plan change that we have done as a Council in a generation" (Our Nelson, Issue 176. P.6.). A once in a generation plan change deserves a much longer period for public review.	Reject	Section 10
1997	S510.004	Adrian Parlane	Mapping	Oppose	Request that Council amend it to General Residential Zone.	We, the undersigned residents of Stoke oppose the designation of our area as a Medium Density Zone. [Refer to the Petition attached to this submission for the 70 signatories in support of this submission].	Reject in part	Section 12

1998	S511.001	Tim Houston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Halt all proceedings in relation to Plan Change 29 before restarting the entire process, commencing within widespread, open, and democratic, public consultation and planning.	We are supportive of more intensification in Nelson, but this plan is too extreme and does not consider existing residents' needs, health, and happiness. The plan also lacks detailed analysis of infrastructure demands that will come from the proposed plan. Some of the reasons for this are listed below: - Buildings greater than two stories would cause almost total loss of sunlight to our house and garden. - Greater than two stories would cause a significant loss of privacy to our family which would negatively impact us. - Turning the inner suburbs into 3-6 level apartments would drive away families, with children or other dependents, and pets. - The Plan appears to lack any meaningful analysis of the prosed zones including the effects of intensification on roading, infrastructure, travel corridors etc. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
1999	S512.001	Nelson Tasman Climate Forum	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support Plan Change 29.	We support Plan Change 29 because we are concerned about climate change and see that housing intensification in the central city is one of the key tools that council has to respond to this threat. Smaller, higher and more compact housing has the potential to save energy, use resources more efficiently, and enables residents to live without a car, which in turn reduces the need to build new roads. It takes the pressure off subdividing greenfield sites on the outskirts of town. Building higher over an exposed permeable surface will also bring some defence against flood hazard and is an adaptation to extreme weather events. We also support plan change 29 from a housing equity perspective. We need more affordable housing in Nelson. It's the workers in Nelson who keep this city going, yet many of them struggle with housing affordability and insecurity. Building more houses, especially a mixture of housing types will help address the housing crisis. We support the concept of the 15 minute city, in which all basic amenities can be reached within 15 minutes of active or public transport. [Refer to the original submission for more details]	Accept in part	Section 9
2000	S512.002	Nelson Tasman Climate Forum	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Develop more fine-grained plans for neighbourhood development taking into account specific features such as location, aspect, topography, access to services and amenities, overland flow paths, flood protection and watercourses, infrastructure, significant trees and vegetation, heritage items, aesthetics of street view and commercial aspects like land value vs. capitalisation.	We are concerned about the process of this plan change, and ask whether there is an overall vision for Nelson over the next 50 years. Each urban block needs careful consideration to find the best way forward and consultation with those living and working there. We support the submission of Nelson Tasman 2050, which elaborates on this point.	Reject	Section 12
2001	FS78.032	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Neighbourhood Spatial plans including heritage considerations. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources.	Reject	Section 13
2002	FS78.289	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Neighbourhood Spatial plans including heritage considerations. PC29 facilitates loss of heritage resources. The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice.	Reject	Section 13

2003	FS65.314	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Neighbourhood Spatial plans including heritage considerations. 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 in part	Section 12
2004	S512.008	Nelson Tasman Climate Forum	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Consider increased tree-covered areas in the urban landscape to add to the shade, cooling and permeability of the urban area.	Refer to reasons in submission point S512.001.	Accept in part	Section 13
2005	S512.013	Nelson Tasman Climate Forum	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the creation of the new housing zones to allowgreater height and density close to the central city areaand around key transport links.	This is essential for climate change, resource efficiency and housing justice.	Support	Section 12
2006	S514.001	Nicholas Adams	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Develop a better vision of how it would actually be in the future. Or how we would want it to look in the future. Then change the rules to facilitate that.	Do not rush into allowing this major change without considering what the finished landscape could look like. I don't see the Councils vision and leadership (I am sure it is there). It appears to me that it is just change the rules and let the individual property owners do the rest. This seems quite hopeful. And hope is not a strategy.	Accept in part	Section 12
2007	S514.002	Nicholas Adams	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Develop the Inner [City] and City Fringe areas first.	In these area, Commercial buildings are already in existence. The number of single dwelling residential housing is relatively small. Consider allowing much higher buildings here. The existing green spaces are limited. People living in the city center will reinvigorate it.	Accept in part	Section 13
2008	S514.004	Nicholas Adams	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Give the community more opportunity to have a real input into developing the new rules.	This would not be dissimilar to water catchment groups in rural settings.	Reject	Section 13
2009	S515.001	Steven Langford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S515.002.	Reject	Section 13
2010	S515.002	Steven Langford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2011	S515.003	Steven Langford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
2012	S515.004	Steven Langford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
2013	S515.006	Steven Langford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S515.005.	Reject	Section 13

2014	S515.010	Steven Langford	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
2015	S515.011	Steven Langford	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 12
2016	FS28.034	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 in part	Section 12
2017	S515.013	Steven Langford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
2018	S515.018	Steven Langford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S515.005 and S515.011.	Reject	Section 13
2019	S515.019	Steven Langford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2020	S515.027	Steven Langford	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
2021	S515.029	Steven Langford	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2022	S515.030	Steven Langford	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

2023	S516.001	Margaret Soderberg	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Request that NCC vote against Plan 29 and restart the process to better consult with the community.	Consultation has been inadequate for a Plan Change of this magnitude and the number of documents; the time period has been too short, engagement with affected communities has been insufficient. PPC29 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. Some level of intensification is required but this is a disproportionate response to established need and the local market. It is inconsistent with: - Te Tauihu Intergenerational Strategy - Te Ara Whakatū, Council's Spatial Plan - Future Development Strategy - Taonga Tuku Iho Strategy. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2024	FS83.131	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
2025	S516.002	Margaret Soderberg	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdrawal of the intensification provisions of Proposed Plan Change 29, [if the Plan Change proceeds].	Refer to reasons in submission point S516.001.	Reject	Section 9
2026	FS83.132	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
2027	S516.003	Margaret Soderberg	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Undertake a new precautionary, staged approach to planning a level of intensification as signalled in the FDS evaluation reviews, [if the Plan Change proceeds].	Refer to reasons in submission point S516.001.	Reject	Section 13
2028	FS83.133	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
2029	S516.007	Margaret Soderberg	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Request, if the Plan Change proceeds] development of new intensifications plans should be based on:	Refer to reasons in submission point S516.001.	Reject	Section 13
2030	FS78.290	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Development of new intensifications plans including effect on heritage resources. 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 13
2031	FS65.316	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Development of new intensifications plans including effect on heritage resources. 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 in part	Section 12
2032	FS83.137	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
2033	S516.008	Margaret Soderberg	Mapping	Oppose	[Request, if the Plan Change proceeds] removal of the proposed HDZ and MDZ from all land currently zoned residential and reinstate amenity controls in NRMP including daylight and setbacks.	Refer to reasons in submission point S516.001.	Reject	Section 9
2034	FS83.138	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
2035	S516.009	Margaret Soderberg	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Request, if the Plan Change proceeds] medium density zoning to be restricted to the Inner City and Inner-City Fringe Zones.	Refer to reasons in submission point S516.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2036	FS83.139	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12

2037	S516.010	Margaret Soderberg	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request if the Plan Change proceeds to] plan for regular reviews of the FDS to incrementally provide for intensification if demand is established.	Refer to reasons in submission point S516.001.	Reject	Section 10
2038	FS83.140	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
2039	S516.012	Margaret Soderberg	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request if the Plan Change proceeds the] replacement of the 2 councillors on the hearing panel with independent commissioners due to perceived conflicts of interest.	Refer to reasons in submission point S516.001.	Reject	Section 13
2040	FS83.142	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
2041	S516.031	Margaret Soderberg	Infrastructure	Not Stated	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the water from the Maitai Dam from greater population, and the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and storm water systems.	Refer to the reasons in S516.001.	Reject	Section 11
2042	FS83.144	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
2043	S518.001	Anne Chilcott	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdrawal Plan Change 29.	Future Development Strategy Plan, which was worked on alongside TDC, should be continued and not sidelined. Plan Change 29 can be re-worked, giving time for each area of medium/high-density zones to have meaningful consultation. Having a plan thrust open the residents is not the way to build the kind of city which we all want to live in. It's imperative that existing neighbourhoods' wellbeing is not destroyed for the quick-fix of being able to say there's another 500 apartments/homes coming on line. Shared vision with TDC makes a lot of sense. I wholeheartedly agree with Timo Neubauer's suggestions in his recent opinion piece in the Nelson Mail. I urge the Council to listen to their residents and take all the time needed to get this right.	Reject	Section 9
2044	S518.002	Anne Chilcott	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Carry out consultation with individual neighbourhoods.	Refer to reasons in submission point S518.001.	Reject	Section 13
2045	S520.001	Vanessa Hardinge	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose Plan Change 29.	The changes will impact areas that are considered iconic of Nelson, the views of the harbour when walking on Princess Drive or any street on the hills along the harbourfront (Britannia Heights neighbourhood). This particular neighbourhood is seen as an iconic part of Nelson and housing intensification will spoil it for residents and tourists.	Reject	Section 9
2046	S521.001	Marina White	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Stop [Plan Change 29] and rethink more environmentally friendly, community-minded, and friendly alternatives.	This mass infill proposal will inevitably lead to loss of sunlight and daylight, the right of every human! That a property owner does not have the right to any notification of development next door is iniquitous! The whole scheme is a developers' delight, the types of infill buildings that they are proposing will lead to a mishmash of heights among present residential properties. They have plans to develop housing without car parking, this is completely unfeasible in this type of city. Especially while the public transport infrastructure in the wider region is not sufficent. Very little consideration has been given to history or heritage in this proposal. You will disrupt the beautiful tree-covered, unique and vibrant city of Nelson.	Reject	Section 9

2047	FS65.317	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Stop the plan change [Very little consideration has been given to history or heritage in this proposal.] 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 in part	Section 12
2048	S522.003	Annette Win	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Pause] intensification of residential zones until intensification of CBD has proven successful.	Nelson CBD has lost its vibrancy and has a number of empty buildings. In general there is a feeling of decline. We suggest Council starts with intensification in the CBD, in an effort to revitalise the city. Only then, should further intensification be considered. Intensification of the residential zones should be more considered and designled. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2049	S524.001	Paul Barter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose Plan Change 29.	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. A balanced approach to housing intensification is necessary to ensure that Nelson continues to be a desirable and sustainable place to live. The current Plan Change 29, as it stands, does not adequately address my concerns and is unlikely to meet the needs of the community.	Reject	Section 9
2050	S524.003	Paul Barter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Reconsider the area designated for medium and high density residential and restrict these developments to the CBD.	To preserve the character of existing residential neighbourhoods.	Reject in part	Section 12
2051	S525.001	Jane Rogers	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Design comprehensive neighborhood plans.	I agree that there is no doubt that Nelson needs intensification to prevent continual urban sprawl into agricultural and horticultural land. I believe Plan 29 is proposing a one size fits all approach that permits building development that fits few criteria. For a successful intensification policy Nelson city council must design comprehensive neighbourhood plans first. This includes upholding the character, nature and landscaping of the neighbourhood. These would outline the specific goals for each neighbourhood in a co-ordinated way.	Reject	Section 13
2052	FS78.291	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Develop neighbourhood plans. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Accept in part	Section 12
2053	FS65.318	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Develop neighbourhood plans. 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 13
2054	S526.001	Michael Monaghan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29 and consult with the submitter on all aspects of this now and in the future.	We understand that this is the biggest plan change proposal the council has ever undertaken. It is important that the approach to this proposed plan change is carefully managed. The Plan Change, once enacted, will have a dramatic effect on our city and one that we will not be able to retrench from. It is our hope that the concerns and alternative solutions outlined in this submission will be considered going forward.	Reject	Section 13
2055	S527.001	Amy Ridout	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	[Support] more intensification because it will contribute to a livelier city, with more people travelling on foot or by bicycle.	I agree we need more housing and we should not be building on greenfield/arable land.	Accept in part	Section 12
2056	S527.002	Amy Ridout	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	[Create] an overarching plan for design and quality, so that buildings are attractive and fit into their surroundings.	I think each development should be planned on a case-by-case basis, looking at each street/neighbourhood. We don't want big developers building as cheaply as possible.	Reject	Section 10

2057	S528.001	Greg Hornsby	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	[Support] residential intensification in central Nelson but taking into account the immediate surroundings and ensuring a good standard quality of build.	Nelson would benefit from higher density in the central areas that would provide good quality but affordable accommodation. In order for the city to grow, become more vibrant and diverse but also to reduce car journeys and encourage walking/cycling around the city. Affordable housing is also very important as there are far too many struggling renters who are living in sub-standard accommodation.	Accept in part	Section 12
2058	S531.001	David Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S531.002.	Reject	Section 13
2059	S531.002	David Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2060	S531.003	David Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
2061	S531.004	David Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
2062	S531.006	David Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S531.005.	Reject	Section 13
2063	S531.010	David Collier	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
2064	S531.011	David Collier	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 12
2065	FS28.035	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 in part	Section 12
2066	S531.013	David Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13

2067	S531.018	David Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S531.005 and S531.011.	Reject	Section 13
2068	S531.019	David Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2069	S531.025	David Collier	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
2070	S531.027	David Collier	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2071	S531.028	David Collier	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2072	S532.001	Kerry Haycock	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reconsider this proposal and to develop a plan that is more sustainable and equitable.	I have the following concerns about Plan Change 29: Impact the historic nature of many neighbourhoods surrounding the CBD. Construction currently accounts for 30% of the world's carbon footprint. With our abundant forestry resources, Nelson should be leading in the development of net carbon-zero buildings. Plan Change 29 will add to our carbon footprint. It will lead to increased traffic congestion and air pollution. It will put pressure on infrastructure, such as utilities, schools, hospitals, and public transport. It will harm the environment by increasing the risk of loss of native bush, landscape trees, increased runoff from more hard surfaces adding to flooding and erosion risks. Loss of light to neighbouring properties impact the ability to utilise solar PV, garden crops and enjoyment of the sunny Nelson climate in our backyards. It will displace existing residents and businesses [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12

2073	FS32.010	Peter Olorenshaw		Oppose	Reject	94% of our carbon footprint in this region is in transport according to Statistics NZ (see Nelsust submission for references, screenshots of this). Allowing more people to live close-in to amenities to their place of work, education and shopping means low carbon transport modes like active and public transport become more viable - bike journeys are shorter, buses can be more frequent in denser populated areas which means they become a more viable option for more people. Conversely forcing new housing to the periphery means extra for infrastructure costs ($ and CO2) now and maintenance into the future as against using existing infrastructure for new houses in the close-in areas. (Replacing an existing 3 or 4 bedroomed house with 3 or 4 or 6, one and two bedroomed units does not have to involve significant extra water supply, stormwater loading or wastewater volume. For a start what is the extra load on 3 waters with two couples living in a house that has been partitioned into two over the family of 5 that used to occupy that house even if they had the same water supply fittings. But modern low flow fittings mean that many more people can use the same volume of water previously used and this results in the same volume of wastewater as previously: Most of these older houses had 12 litre per flush toilets each time the toilet is flushed be it for urine or faeces - there are 4.5/3 litre flush toilets available now, likewise with washing machines - modern front loaders use perhaps 1/3 of traditional top loaders that the old house probably had and aerated taps and shower heads give the feeling of a full shower at much lower water usage. This lower water usage not only means less potable water is required, but also there is correspondingly less	Accept in part	Section 11
2074	FS78.033	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Develop a better plan [Impact the historic nature of many neighbourhoods surrounding the CBD. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13
2075	FS65.323	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Develop a better plan [Impact the historic nature of many neighbourhoods surrounding the CBD. 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 13
2076	S532.002	Kerry Haycock	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict any high-density living (i.e. dwellings 3 stories or higher) to the Mixed Use and Centre City zones already set out in the draft Whakamahere Whakatū Nelson Plan and [amend] the [proposed] "high density" [areas] under PC 29 [to retain their current zoning under the NRMP].	Refer to reasons in submission point S532.001. I appreciate 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 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 medium-rise and commercial buildings. However, I do not believe we should allow developers to build these 3-6-story high-rise developments through our existing family neighbourhoods, especially without resource consent. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12
2077	S532.003	Kerry Haycock	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Notify property owners of proposed changes to the zoning of their property, increase public consultation timeframes, and address confusion due to inconsistencies with the draft Nelson Plan and Future Development Strategy as well as terminology used [inferred].	Poor communication over recent time including inconsistencies, confusion, short time frames and lack of notice in the consultation process. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

2078	S533.001	Deborah Allais	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Restrict any high density living (i.e. dwellings 3 stories or higher) to the [Inner City Fringe] and Centre City zones.	Lack of notice, inconsistency of information and short time frame: The short time frame between information being made public and accessible (voluminous document which is only available on line) and lack of notice given for the proposed plan. Main inconsistency from what has been proposed for the future growth of nelson and what is being proposed in PC 29. Lack of foresight into the planning of Nelson as a city and future climate changes: What urban planning and housing concepts are needed to meet the challenges of climate change and the changing society of work, leisure, family and old age? How can water, vegetation and passive solar power be combined in this design? What are the accompanying infrastructures? How should pedestrian and vehicle traffic, public and private, services and deliveries, household waste management in private lots and street collection be organised in this densely populated city? How can new social life spots (café shop, small shops or service points) be integrated into these denser residential areas? What policy to encourage a social diversity in dense areas?	Accept in part	Section 12
2079	S533.002	Deborah Allais	Mapping	Oppose	Leave theareas currentlymarked "highdensity" under PC 29as they currently are.	Refer to reasons in submission point S533.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2080	S534.003	Lynette Nicholas	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Restrict the areas designated for medium and high-density residential development to the Central Business District (CBD).	I strongly urge the Council to reconsider the areas designated for medium and high-density residential development. It would be more suitable to restrict these developments to the Central Business District (CBD) to preserve the character of existing residential neighbourhoods.	Reject	Section 12
2081	S535.001	Hamish Barker	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S535.002.	Reject	Section 13
2082	S535.002	Hamish Barker	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design, taking into account the submissions already received, and then put it back out for public submissions.	A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. I am upset that I have been put in a position of hoping more qualified citizens than I will make more comprehensive submissions covering my concerns. The poorly prepared PC 29 will result in thousands of opposing submissions, reading and processing these will entail a massive workload for council which will cost a lot of money. If Council had gone through a proper consultation process must of this wasteful effort could have been saved. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2083	S535.003	Hamish Barker	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Remove one or the two councillors who have already voted twice in favour of PC29 and replace them with one of the councillors who voted in favour of Councillor Courtney's proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September council meeting.	Councillor Dennis Rohan O'Neill-Stevens voted twice in favour of the plan. Councillor Trudie Brand has also voted against Councillor Courtney's proposal at the 14th September meeting. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2084	S535.006	Hamish Barker	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S535.005.	Reject	Section 13
2085	S535.010	Hamish Barker	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12

2086	S535.011	Hamish Barker	Mapping	Oppose	Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district, 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.	Refer to reasons in submission point S535.010.	Reject	Section 12
2087	FS28.118	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district; 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 in part	Section 12
2088	S535.013	Hamish Barker	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
2089	S535.019	Hamish Barker	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2090	S535.027	Hamish Barker	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
2091	S535.029	Hamish Barker	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2092	S535.030	Hamish Barker	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2093	S536.001	Leah Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Remove the plan changeother than the city centre.	I do not believe all parts of Plan 29 are the correct decisions to make. I oppose most of the plan but not all.	Reject	Section 9

2094	S536.005	Leah Collier	Mapping	Oppose	Amend the zoning for Tahunanui Hill from Medium and High Density Residential to General Residential [inferred].	I believe the Tahuna hill area set out for medium-high density is absolutely absurd. Tosswill, Tamaki, Chamberlain etc is in absolutely no way an area that should have even been considered for development. There are springs all across the hill, they have a hard time with waterlogged properties even in minimal rain. [Additional reasons cited include: Risk of slips, Views from the hillside, Lack of bus access, Limited safe crossings on Tahunanui Drive, Lack of town hub, and Health and wellbeing of residents. Refer to section 4 in the original submission for more detail].	Accept in part	Section 12
2095	S536.012	Leah Collier	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the high density residential zone from all areas except the city centre [inferred].	I strongly oppose the High-Density Residential Zones anywhere other than the city centre.	Accept in part	Section 12
2096	S536.015	Leah Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
2097	S536.020	Leah Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood and are not greatly damaging neighbours sunlight.	Refer to reasons in submission points S536.004 and S536.017.	Reject	Section 13
2098	S536.021	Leah Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Contemporary Black Iron Clad Boxes, built only a few metres from 120-year-old Historic Homes is a thoughtless lack of long-term vision for maintaining the attraction of Nelson for all the future residents and visitors.	Reject	Section 13
2099	S536.023	Leah Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2100	S536.030	Leah Collier	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. I do not want to see Franklin Village style developments showing up all across Nelson.	Reject	Section 13
2101	S536.032	Leah Collier	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2102	FS25.019	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 12

2103	S536.033	Leah Collier	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2104	S537.004	Gardner Bickford	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Include a requirement for at least 20% of new parking areas, pathways, and sidewalks to be created with permeable materials.	The benefits to our environment, especially regarding stormwater management, are not only well documented but also align with New Zealand's commitment to sustainability.	Reject	Section 13
2105	S537.005	Gardner Bickford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Support Plan Change 29.	The subject of urban intensification is a vital one. It allows us to make more efficient use of our land and resources, reducing environmental strain and making our communities more accessible. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 9
2106	S537.006	Gardner Bickford	Entire Plan Change	Support	Applaud the provisionsalready included in Plan Change 29 -such as the adjusted heightlimitations for buildings.	Refer to reasons in submission point S537.005.	Accept in part	Section 12
2107	S537.007	Gardner Bickford	Inner City and City Fringe Zones	Support	Applaud the provisions already included in Plan Change 29 - such as the encouragement of mixed use development.	Refer to reasons in submission point S537.005.	Accept in part	Section 12
2108	S538.001	Alice Hill	Mapping	Support in part	[Revise] the Tahunanui High Density Residential Zoning (HDRZ) as currently proposed and consider HDRZ focused on the Tahunanui Dr corridor in addition to (or rather than) on the lower reaches of the slopes between Tosswill Rd and Tamaki St. Alternatively, consider more incremental building heights that would allow for a "mid-high" zone, to allow for up to 4 levels.	Progressive planning from international case studies shows that the highest intensification along key transport corridors is a successful approach. Much of the Tahunanui Drive section between Bisley and Wakatu Dr is also geographically suited to this in having a flat bench at road level in front of steep (and somewhat unstable) rise to approx 6-8 stories high. I believe this would be an opportune combination of providing stability/retaining for hillslopes, increased housing and commercial activity adjacent to a transport artery, and limiting impact on views from existing houses behind?	Accept in part	Section 12
2109	S539.005	Shannon Gourley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Create thought out plans for specific] neighborhood areas - i.e Nelson Central, Tahunanui, Stoke and Atawhai.	I seek that the proposed areas of high density are looked at and there is thought out planning of neighborhood area. ie Nelson central, Tahuanui, Stoke, Atawhai this is where then the consideration of placement, height daylight hours around are then looked at. Fairness to the neighboring properties, not 1 fits all blanket Ie Wellington waterfront using the hill for large scale building area housing.	Accept in part	Section 12
2110	FS78.035	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Develop neighbourhood plans. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13
2111	FS65.327	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: Develop neighbourhood plans. 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 13
2112	S539.006	Shannon Gourley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Focus intensification] on Central Nelson Business area.	Central Nelson business area should be first focal point rather than more of the suburb areas. Concentrate on apartment buildings increasing the number of people that can be in the city hub to give the city central life back around the shops and business.	Accept in part	Section 12
2113	S539.007	Shannon Gourley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Allow intensification in green field areas].	The "green Field Developments should also be looking at intensification as well as all nelson areas. Why are not new development areas not (bottom of hillside) not being considered for developments for higher building apartments they would receive sun and not impact Single story builds. Has it been considered to look at areas and look at a Plan for nelson and outer suburbs of nelson rather than leaving it up to a developer to just build whatever they want with no consideration to neighboring properties.	Reject	Section 13

2114	S540.001	Alexandra Cotton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S540.002. I live in Stoke. In my area houses are currently single storey, with the odd exception, and there is already a lot of infill. Under the proposed new plan we can have up to 3 storey houses built on our sections. This could mean no sun for me and my neighbours and our essential veggie gardens. So many people will be affected. I assume that very few of us will make submissions because we are a good solid working class and social housing area. Actually not too many people in my area even knew about the proposal. So, in Stoke suburbia we may be facing a hotch potch of developers wishing to cash in on the opportunity to build big 3 or 6 storey apartments (with no parking) next door to us. There would be no need for beauty or design or the concept of sponge cities to be considered.	Reject	Section 9
2115	S540.002	Alexandra Cotton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Recommend] a consultative, community lead, problem-solving approach to address Nelson's housing problems.	I believe the Plan Change 29 process did not provide an inclusive environment for everyday people to navigate. I found the huge document too long and difficult to read properly. I am concerned that the summarising of these submissions will be performed by those who were responsible for developing the plan rather than outside, impartial people. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 13
2116	S540.010	Alexandra Cotton	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	I oppose the proposed Medium and High-Density Residential Zones. It is not in character or in keeping with existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
2117	S540.011	Alexandra Cotton	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 12
2118	FS28.036	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 in part	Section 12
2119	S540.013	Alexandra Cotton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
2120	S540.019	Alexandra Cotton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29 to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city followed by the city fringe.]	The Inner City should be the starting place for significant intensification, rather than starting intensification in suburban areas. This would enable more time for designers and the community to envision and plan our residential neighbourhoods. The City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification.	Reject	Section 10
2121	S540.027	Alexandra Cotton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Require]Council working closely with Kainga Ora, to provide a 'transparent' way of creating new Social Housing Developments that work with the long-term design vision of Nelson.	Significant care and attention must be considered with all social housing to avoid disharmony in communities. 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
2122	S540.029	Alexandra Cotton	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

2123	S542.001	Susannah Roddick	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw PC 29, refine the plan design, and review the process and professional structuresthat will guide the plan and then put it back out for public submissions.	[I am] oppose[d] because of process. My feedback is in response to NCC's own statement that this is the biggest Plan change ever done. That is why I am distressed that something this complex, huge and significant is so confusing to understand, and appears to be reliant on citizens such as me, studying complex documentation in the evenings and trying to distil and respond. The NCC process for something this major requires an entire rethink, using far more expert, trained and diverse people, than someone such as me. That's why we have a Council and why I reject the proposal in its entirety, due to this flawed process. I also feel that if I don't feed back, then feedback will risk being dominated by developer-led interests, who are familiar and expert in such detail. So I feel worried that I've got to comment on such a huge and complex plan change, ranging from light planes, angles, to object assessments and flood risk. I expect the NCC to be leaders in our city's future, and to set the tone, expertise, and a graduated approach to change that is progressive, and not rushed, and to lead out with a vision for our city.	Reject	Section 13
2124	S542.002	Susannah Roddick	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Establish] an Urban development agency to work on a planned approach for residential development and protection of heritage facades, areas, and buildings.	I agree with the creation of some kind of an Urban development agency, to work on such a planned approach for our residential development, and a planned approach to protect heritage facades, areas, and buildings. (There has to better process than NCC releasing 100s of pages, with high stakes for us all - to which residents, such as me, then have to feedback on).	Reject	Section 13
2125	S542.003	Susannah Roddick	Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely [inferred].	I strongly reject the High-Density Residential Zone. This goes beyond what the government's intent appears to be. It appears as if NCC has suddenly moved from zero to HDRZ. Without a strong sense of what MD looks like, or could look like. Intensification should be done gradually and thoughtfully, and be lead by design that maintains neighbourhood character and links to public transport, cycleways, greenery, play space and sustainable living. I am very much against so much high rise, across our residential areas, and up to 6 stories. While I support intensification, however I strongly disagree with 6 story buildings. That would make our city a dreary place, reduce sun and space for plants and for people who enjoy both, increase wind being funnelled, create a narrowness, and lack of sky. The NCC wants to be encouraging and leading in livable design, The NCC images used to discuss 6 stories are not ever 6 storey images. So I'm distressed the plan allows for so many buildings higher that Bett Apartments (which is not even 6 storeys). I [am] oppose[d] because of substance re HDRZ 6 storey intensification, sunlight, and the need to use professionals and design expertise to create and to communicate a more gradual and nuanced approach to this vital plan.	Reject	Section 12
2126	S542.007	Susannah Roddick	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Work closely with Kainga Ora on developing affordable low rise density living for the vulnerable [inferred].	Low rise density living may support the vulnerable where it is affordable, and I support NCC working closely with Kainga Ora on this. Again, I encourage NCC to lead in this.	Reject	Section 13

2127	S543.001	Paul Searle	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Scrap the current plan. Regroup after 2024 Local Body elections, with a fairer range of proposals and with a panel of five or seven Councillors elected on their position on PC29.	As a resident of the proposed HDRZ, I strongly oppose Plan Change 29, which needs to be scaled back. The scale of policy and planning control changes oversteps the projected population grown tenfold. The reduction in daylight permitted by multi storeyed development, one metre from Boundaries is Barbaric. Why should anyone be allowed to build a property that overlooks and impinges on neighbours. This will not result in better quality of life and social harmony, but the opposite. Current Council proposals benefit in reducing greater affordability for young families and first time buyers is inaccurate. The current make-up , with only two Councillors, who both appear strongly biased towards development will be unlikely to deliver a democratic result for the people of Central Nelson who will be most negatively affected by the proposed changes. The Councils actions in approving the proposal have caused huge stress among residents. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12
2128	S543.003	Paul Searle	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Enable] development in Maitai Valley if developers contribute to infrastructure and drainage costs for the subdivision.	I would also support development in the Maitai Valley if developers were made to contribute appropriately for infrastructure and drainage costs to support the subdivision.	Reject	Section 11
2129	S544.001	Andrea Papai	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	I do find the Plan 29 flawed. So flawed, I reject it in its entirety. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
2130	S544.002	Andrea Papai	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	Firstly, this has caused my family a lot of stress. It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2131	S544.003	Andrea Papai	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
2132	S544.004	Andrea Papai	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
2133	S544.006	Andrea Papai	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S544.005. Made with input of the local residents and actual architects/designers who care about now and the future. We local residents need to be consulted and our views taken into serious consideration.	Reject	Section 13
2134	S544.010	Andrea Papai	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
2135	S544.013	Andrea Papai	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13

2136	S544.018	Andrea Papai	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S544.005 and S544.011.	Reject	Section 13
2137	S544.019	Andrea Papai	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2138	S544.025	Andrea Papai	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
2139	S544.027	Andrea Papai	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2140	S544.028	Andrea Papai	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2141	S545.001	Jeremy Butler	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the Plan Change [subject to the improvements set out in the submission].	The plan change supports the development of density and promotes mixed use developments.	Accept in part	Section 12
2142	S546.001	Michelle Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2143	S546.002	Michelle Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
2144	S546.003	Michelle Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10

2145	S546.005	Michelle Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S546.004.	Reject	Section 13
2146	S546.009	Michelle Collier	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the Medium and High Density Residential Zones from the plan completely.	I strongly oppose the Medium/High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
2147	S546.010	Michelle Collier	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 12
2148	FS28.038	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 in part	Section 12
2149	S546.012	Michelle Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
2150	S546.017	Michelle Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S546.004 and S546.010.	Reject	Section 13
2151	S546.018	Michelle Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. The inner city should be the starting place for the most significant intensification before moving onto existing residential neighbourhoods. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2152	S546.025	Michelle Collier	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
2153	S546.027	Michelle Collier	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

2154	S546.030	Michelle Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Focus higher density development within the CBD, greenfield development, and Haven road area where development doesn't impact other property owners.	I believe that the CBD, Greenfield developments, the Haven road area or any area like that backing onto a hill that doesn't impact other property owners make perfect sense to being used for higher density housing but allowing this in existing built up arears show a distinct lack of planning and thought and will create a Nelson that has no character and is a mixed mess of housing types, we should be looking to create a Nelson that has a vibrant city centre with well planned green spaces, a beautiful waterfront, appropriate housing that fits with the character of the city.	Accept in part	Section 12
2155	S547.001	Karen Loh	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Stop Plan Change 29.	Change Too Fast vs Slow Change: Between Nile Street and Nelson College, and between Rutherford and Collingwood Streets, there are old houses and small buildings. Keep Small Town Feel: Many people, including me, live here because it feels like a small town. We like houses with gardens and quiet, not like big cities. Talk to Community: I don't like PC29 because it doesn't ask people about things like shadows or how it changes the community. Not Enough Information: I get letters about small things, like fixing water, but not about big changes to my house area with PC29. Hard Online Papers and Short Time: The PC29 papers on the internet are hard to understand, and there's not much time to talk about them. This makes it hard for people to say what they think. Different from Old Plans: PC29 is different from old plans for Nelson. Before, they said buildings can be 11m tall, but now they say 12m. Not Clear Information: The information about the Nelson Plan and future plans was not clear. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12
2156	S548.001	Timothy Ng	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Stop Plan Change 29.	I'm okay with more buildings in the city. We need more houses because more people are coming to live here. But I want the city to grow in a good way that fits with how it is now. I don't like Plan29 for these reasons: Shadows and Privacy: Plan29 will make buildings that are too tall. This can block the sun for other houses and make them dark. This is not good for people living there and can make houses cost less. Also, tall buildings can look into other people's houses, and this is not private. Confusing Information: The information about the Nelson Plan and future plans was not clear. Random Big Buildings: From what I understand, Plan Change 29 says we can have many tall buildings, but not many will be built for a long time. This means some areas might get big buildings and look different, while others stay the same. This can make our city look messy. Traffic and Parking Problems: Tall buildings mean more cars and traffic. The new plan doesn't talk about car parking much. Old City Systems: The city has old systems for things like water, roads, and services. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
2157	S548.002	Timothy Ng	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Support] taller buildings in the city centre where there are already big buildings. But I don't wait them in [residential areas].	More people are coming to Nelson, so we need more houses. I'm okay with taller buildings (4-6 stories) in the city center where there are already big buildings. But I don't want them in family areas. We can make more houses by building two-story apartments or dividing big lands into smaller parts. This fits better with how our community looks and feels.	Accept in part	Section 12

2158	S551.001	Jude Osborne	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29 in its entirety.	Reject Plan 29 until the public know the findings of the National Policy Statement on Climate, with respect to inundation and sea level rise, as well as the findings of Plan Change 30, regarding Nelson Airport, Extension to the north, and its impact on Tahunanui residents and businesses. Regarding future development in Tahunanui, there is a disconnect between proposed densification in Tahunanui Hills around Tamaki Street and its distance from the beachside community of Tahunanui, as well as lacking amenities and public transportation. This effectively creates an isolated commuter suburb, with no nearby supermarkets, bus stops or cycle lanes, and segregated from the flat beachside village of Tahunanui, its school and kindergarten. There are difficulties accessing Tamaki Street in all modes of transport. There is only one pedestrian zebra street crossing by Tahunanui School, meaning a distinct lack of infrastructure to support densification. The junction of Toswill Road and Tahunanui Drive is the site of many serious accidents including two fatalities - involving cars, cyclists and pedestrians. Heritage - Tahunanui is in the presence of many Taonga, including at the base of Bisley Avenue, at the car yard and pharmacy site as well as the Basin Reserve on Rocks Road. These are areas of significant cultural heritage and need to be treated with respect and reverence.	Reject	Section 9
2159	FS61.036	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Reject Plan 29 until the public know the findings of the National Policy Statement on Climate, with respect to inundation and sea level rise, as well as the findings of Plan Change 30, regarding Nelson Airport, Extension to the north, and its impact on Tahunanui residents and businesses. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support Totally correct, we don't have all of the available data to make a community based Tahunanui plan.	Accept in part	Section 12
2160	FS60.027	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Reject Plan 29 until the public know the findings of the National Policy Statement on Climate, with respect to inundation and sea level rise, as well as the findings of Plan Change 30, regarding Nelson Airport, Extension to the north, and its impact on Tahunanui residents and businesses. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support Totally correct, we don't have all of the available data to make a community based Tahunanui plan.	Accept in part	Section 12
2161	S551.002	Jude Osborne	Mapping	Oppose	Oppose the proposed high density in residential areas where there are increased natural hazards - flooding - inundation - land instability.	I believe there should be no high density zones on any hillsides in any zones within Nelson. Priority needs to be given to all higher density zones being only applied on flat, stable land within walking, cycling and public transport means to the inner city. I believe in the right development in the right area.	Accept	Section 12
2162	S551.003	Jude Osborne	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Focus initial intensification on the Inner City before moving into residential neighbourhoods . Intensification within the city could be over 3 stories, but the suburbs only need to go to 3 stories.	This will allow for time for proper engagement with communities. Each community should be given the opportunity to be given an overview or plan for their community, a collaborative approach between Council and Community to influence the Shaping of their Nelson. An example of this is the ratified Tahunanui Structure Plan (2004), helping to obtain community buyin and concensus.	Reject	Section 10
2163	S551.005	Jude Osborne	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Preserve] Nelson's beautiful sight lines.	Nelson's beautiful sight lines should be preserved - nothing should be higher than the cathedral for example. These are significant tourist attractions and part of why people visit Nelson. Poorly planned intensification could ruin Nelson's inherent charm and character. Intensification within the city could be over 3 stories, but the suburbs only need to go to 3 stories.	Accept in part	Section 12

2164	FS78.298	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: [Preserve] Nelson's beautiful sight lines. I support the Church Hill view shaft.	Reject	Section 12
2165	FS65.332	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: [Preserve] Nelson's beautiful sight lines. 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. 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 in part	Section 12
2166	S552.001	Nelson Residents Association	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Delay implementation [of Plan Change 29].	Not stated.	Reject	Section 10
2167	FS32.007	Peter Olorenshaw		Oppose	Reject	We have housing crisis and a climate change crisis. We can not delay the implementation for PC29 as we need to house more people urgently and it significantly lower carbon now and in perpetuity to do that through intensification than sprawling out to the periphery of existing urban areas. Evidence (https://green-alliance.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Build-up.pdf)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.	Accept	Section 9
2168	S554.001	Leather Langbridge household - Rory Langbridge	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Substantially refine the process to increase the level of local consultations.	Our thoughts are that the strategy that is put forward is a particularly blunt approach to something that requires a far more detailed and nuanced approach in order to get buy in from the community, an essential component, if it is to survive its implantation. In our opinion, it is that bluntness in the approach that exposes the proposed plan to much of the criticism that has been generated and in our opinion is the cause of much of the opposition. It is noted that the Nelson Tasman FDS2022-52 recommended a far more detailed and consultative approach that would require a neighbourhood by neighbourhood spatial plan to identify those specific areas that would suit intensification and which may then garner neighbours support. We recognise that the scope of such a study is far greater than what has been done to date but feel for a 50 year + plan, both detail and support are critical to a successful outcome over the period of implementation. The apparent lack of community and industry engagement within the preparation of PC29 is a concern. This has resulted in the negative reaction to the suggested changes when they were presented as what came across as a fait accompli which has resulted in the strong reaction. We strongly recommend that council commits to direct engagement with the community during the development of the spatial plans and associated plan changes.	Reject	Section 10

2169	S554.002	Leather Langbridge household - Rory Langbridge	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Give detailed planning considerations to local neighbourhoods following consultation.	It is noted that the Nelson Tasman FDS2022-52 recommended a far more detailed and consultative approach that would require a neighbourhood by neighbourhood spatial plan to identify those specific areas that would suit intensification and which may then garner neighbours support. We recognise that the scope of such a study is far greater than what has been done to date but feel for a 50 year + plan, both detail and support are critical to a successful outcome over the period of implementation.	Reject	Section 13
2170	FS78.036	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Develop neighbourhood plans. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents.	Reject	Section 13
2171	FS65.333	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: Develop neighbourhood plans. 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 13
2172	S554.003	Leather Langbridge household - Rory Langbridge	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Develop a strong urban design policy with strategic and specific outcomes that would ensure quality outcomes.	We share the concerns of the Institute of Architects when they opine that in its current form, PC29 is considered inadequate and unable to deliver the urban design outcomes that are needed. The other aspect of the architectural submission that we would like to strongly endorse are their comments and observations around the lack or absence of any qualitative controls and standards in place to provide some comfort to current and future residents that the resulting outcomes will be of good quality and result in good high amenity outcomes.	Reject	Section 13
2173	S554.004	Leather Langbridge household - Rory Langbridge	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Intensify housing supply in and around our primary urban areas.	In general, as a landscape architect I am in support of the need for and intent of the proposed Plan Change 29 to intensify housing supply in and around our primary urban areas and recognise the limitations that exist for the Nelson Richmond area to accommodate an ever-increasing population. For too long Nelson has relied upon a growth strategy that focuses on the development of the city fringes and PC29 makes the right moves towards rectifying that. Intensifying our existing urban areas will create more housing choices, allow people to live closer to where they work and socialise, revitalise the central city, reduce our reliance on cars and allow for more efficient infrastructure investment.	Accept	Section 9
2174	S554.005	Leather Langbridge household - Rory Langbridge	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Set up an urban development agency to oversee and direct the long and short term development of the city.	Not stated.	Accept in part	Section 13
2175	S555.001	Gerrard Wilson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Oppose Plan Change 29 in part, and amend the Plan Change as set out in the submission.	Key reasons include: - Blanket rezoning will lead to ad hoc development throughout the city. - the Plan Change does nothing to revive a dying CBD and instead gives priority to attempting to fix housing affordability. - an extensive high-density residential zone, for the most part, is not appropriate, necessary or fitting in the Nelson context. - the impact on essential residential amenity (sunlight and daylight access) of some rezonings has been given insufficient weight through the Plan Change. - as a result of the package of bulk and location standards for the residential zones, in reality it will limit opportunities for residential growth and housing choice in Nelson. - the section 32 analysis, and supporting documentation, contains flawed assumptions and incomplete assessment, questioning the integrity of the Plan Change. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12

2176	FS78.007	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission I support are: General opposition. Key reasons include: - Blanket rezoning will lead to ad hoc development throughout the city. - the Plan Change does nothing to revive a dying CBD and instead gives priority to attempting to fix housing affordability. Oppose Plan Change 29 in part, and amend the Plan Change as set out in the submission. 338 Plan Section Plan Provision Submission Point Submitter Position Summary of Reasons Summary of Decision Requested - an extensive high-density residential zone, for the most part, is not appropriate, necessary or fitting in the Nelson context. - the impact on essential residential amenity (sunlight and daylight access) of some rezonings has been given insufficient light through the Plan Change. - as a result of the package of bulk and location standards for the residential zones, in reality it will limit opportunities for residential growth and housing choice in Nelson. - the section 32 analysis, and supporting documentation, contains flaId assumptions and incomplete assessment, questioning the integrity of the Plan Change. This is not sustainable, precautionary planning. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. Provisions for intensification are based on quantitative not qualitative measures. PPC29 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 12
2177	S555.003	Gerrard Wilson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Review the composition of the hearings panel and replace Councilors Trudi Brand and Rohan O'Neill-Stevens with independent and qualified professionals with an appropriate level of experience (including at hearings and Environment Court).	Plan Change 29 proposes a suite of changes that, if approved, will arguably comprise the biggest alteration to Nelsons planning controls in its history. By extension, this will also be the largest removal of property rights since the NZ Company surveyed the region. As a consequence, the composition of the hearings panel needs to be appropriate and robust. While Councilors can be appointed to hearings panels, this is not always considered good practice in the planning profession. Moreover, while Councilors Brand and O'Neill-Stevens may be accredited under the 'Making Good Decisions' programme, Cr O'Neill-Stevens holds no other relevant formal qualifications and neither parties are sufficiently experienced to sit of a hearings panel considering a matter of this magnitude. Their appointment challenges and threatens the credibility of the process and its outcome.	Reject	Section 13
2178	FS78.004	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Plan Change 29 proposes a suite of changes that, if approved, will arguably comprise the biggest alteration to Nelsons planning controls in its history. By extension, this will also be the largest removal of property rights since the NZ Company surveyed the region. As a consequence, the composition of the hearings panel needs to be appropriate and robust. Neither of two councillors appointed to Panel are sufficiently experienced to sit of a hearings panel considering a matter of this magnitude. Their appointment challenges and threatens the credibility of the process and its outcome. The Hearing Panel makeup needs to be reviewed due to perceived conflicts of interest. Perception of bias on Panel, lack of qualifications to hear a Plan Change of this magnitude.	Reject	Section 13

2179	S555.004	Gerrard Wilson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Review and prioritise the various elements of PC29 according to their importance under the NPS-UD and FDS and instead introduce them in a staged manner (through the appropriate method, whether that be multiple plan change's or other such mechanism) from a timing and location perspective.	This will enable the NRMP to respond appropriately and in a considered and balanced manner as population demand dictates. The population growth assumptions underpinning PC29, as articulated in the FDS, note a continuing demographic shift with an increase in the over 65 age category, as well as relative decline in some of the younger age categories. Multi-level residential is, for obvious reasons, not favoured by an aging population. Moreover, a larger aged population implies a greater requirement for relatively more lowly paid service industry employment which will further impinge on housing affordability (through a low-wage economy). PC29 does not appear to adequately consider demographic changes as it pertains to the workforce and commercial sector composition, nor the housing typologies that are likely to be demanded in the future. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2180	S556.004	David Hazard	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Reduce the scope of the high density residential zone to properties immediately adjacent to the inner city Nelson and Stoke. e.g. on the city side of Tasman Street, Bronte Street.	It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate.	Reject	Section 12
2181	S556.005	David Hazard	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Reduce the scope of the Medium density residntial zone and replace with the general residential zone.	Not stated.	Accept in part	Section 12
2182	S557.001	Rose Biss	Mapping	Oppose in part	Delete Medium Density Residential Zone from Tahunanui Hills. Retain existing Residential Zone for Tahunanui Hills.	Medium density housing is best located firstly in hazard free areas and secondly where infrastructure services with sufficient capacity are in place before increased density development occurs. Infrastructure includes roading, stormwater, wastewater and water supply. The proposed new height limit of 12m for Medium Density Residential and steeper daylight angles are too high. Also the new limited open space requirements and yards are too small compared to existing rules. The new rules are likely to cause the effects of overlooking, lack of privacy and lack of daylight. There has been insufficient consultation for such a major change in housing density in this part of Nelson's residential area. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
2183	S557.002	Rose Biss	Mapping	Oppose in part	Delete High Density Residential Zone from Tahunanui Hills. Retain existing Residential zoning.	High density housing is best located firstly in hazard free areas and secondly where infrastructure services with sufficient capacity are in place before increased density development occurs. Infrastructure includes roading, stormwater, wastewater and water supply. Proximity to public transport, shopping facilities and open space is also important. The proposed new height limit (19m 6 storey) and steeper daylight angles are too high. There are limited open space requirements and the proposed yard rules are too small. These new rules are likely to cause effects of overlooking, lack of privacy and lack of daylight. There has been insufficient consultation for such a major change in housing density in this part of Nelson's residential area. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12

2184	S558.002	Anne Dickinson	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	I would like NCC to purchase more green space within the depth of these suburbs, for mental health, such as Maire Stream Valley, Tahuna Hills. For NCC to go ahead with taking back from the developer KB Construction, the top end of the valley of Maire Stream.	This would complete NCC land on all sides. This was the promise in 2018 by NCC Freshwater Division that in 10 years if KB Quarries hadn't given this land back , NCC would take it back... This Maire Stream valley is a god given gift for Our community to go to for solace. Right in the heart of suburbia. This piece of Council land can grow. Where people can go walking, have picnics, biking/mountain biking, to sit, dream and do some Forest Bathing (Green Bathing) - this Japanese practice that more western commnities are utilizing, is a process of relaxation, known in Japan as Shinrin Yoku. The simple method of being calm and quiet amongst the trees, observing nature around you whilst breathing deeply can help both adults and children de-stress, boost health and wellbeing in a natural way. The Maire Stream Guardians/Nurturers are enriching this areas biodiversity for all flora, fauna and community. To inspire people to care for and have a respect of our natural environment. Save Maire Stream valley from an/density housing. NCC, get it back from the developer KB Construction. And grow Nelson Society healthier!	Reject	Section 13
2185	S560.008	Jane Bayley	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Retain existing density and allotment size within the dress circle around the Cathedral [area not defined but understood to be the area approximately bounded by Selwyn Place, Rutherford Street, Van Diemen Street and Collingwood Street].	Nelson has a special cultural site at Piki Mai / the Cathedral. Over development and dominance from tall structures around that will have an impact on both the spiritual and cultural aspect of this site and should be avoided. NCC once had a priority of recognising and seeking to retain its history. PC 29 totally ignores this by changing the density of what is currently low density into high density. Taking a concentric circle to determine planning zones is not considering the effects on the local community, its heritage, its risks or its areas of cultural importance. I consider it poor and unconsidered planning.	Reject	Section 12
2186	FS78.299	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Retain existing density and allotment size within the dress circle around the Cathedral [Nelson has a special cultural site at Piki Mai / the Cathedral. Over development and dominance from tall structures around that will have an impact on both the spiritual and cultural aspect of this site and should be avoided. NCC once had a priority of recognising and seeking to retain its history. PC 29 totally ignores this by changing the density of what is currently low density into high density. Taking a concentric circle to determine planning zones is not considering the effects on the local community, its heritage, its risks or its areas of cultural importance. I consider it poor and unconsidered planning.] 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.	Accept in part	Section 12

2187	FS65.334	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Retain existing density and allotment size within the dress circle around the Cathedral [Nelson has a special cultural site at Piki Mai / the Cathedral. Over development and dominance from tall structures around that will have an impact on both the spiritual and cultural aspect of this site and should be avoided. NCC once had a priority of recognising and seeking to retain its history. PC 29 totally ignores this by changing the density of what is currently low density into high density. Taking a concentric circle to determine planning zones is not considering the effects on the local community, its heritage, its risks or its areas of cultural importance. I consider it poor and unconsidered planning.] 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 in part	Section 12
2188	S560.017	Jane Bayley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Increased [building] height levels should be limited to within the City's "Square".	Refer to reasons in submission point S560.004.	Reject	Section 12
2189	S560.018	Jane Bayley	Natural Hazards/Climate Change	Oppose in part	Retain existing density and allotment size within Flood Zones.	Nelson has a number of hazards and enabling intensification within hazard areas is short sighted and should be avoided.	Reject	Section 9
2190	S561.008	Kirsten Brown	Natural Hazards/Climate Change	Support in part	Support the way that the proposed plan change has greater regard for the risks posed by natural hazards and the effects that these have on land use and development.	I am in support of the way that the proposed plan change has greater regard for the risks posed by natural hazards and the effects that these land use and development.	Accept	Section 11
2191	S561.009	Kirsten Brown	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	When developing the zoning and rules, bear in mind that the nature of development in New Zealand over the last 10 - 15 years has tended toward maximising profit at the expense of quality structures and living environments and innovative, sustainable development solutions.	When developing their zoning and rules, please bear in mind that the nature of development in New Zealand over the last 10 - 15 years has tended toward maximising profit at the expense of quality structures and living environments and innovative, sustainable development solutions.	Reject	Section 9
2192	S561.010	Kirsten Brown	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	General support for the objectives to increase residential density in Nelson City, create a more vibrant city, reduce sprawl, and provide a greater variety of living opportunities.	In general, I am also supportive of the objectives to increase residential density in Nelson City, create a more vibrant city, reduce sprawl, and provide a greater variety of living opportunities, however there are some specific objectives, policies, and rules with respect to the residential zones that I do not agree with and think should be reconsidered. These are detailed in other points in my submission.	Accept	Section 9
2193	S561.011	Kirsten Brown	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Consider a realistic level of future growth.	A realistic level of future growth must be considered for Nelson, and I think the proposed plan change is considering growth well beyond what is realistic. It is prioritizing density and development too strongly and ignoring the adverse effects that these may have on existing character and amenity that have and will retain value for current and future residents.	Reject	Section 10

2194	S562.001	Hugh Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose Proposed Plan Change 29 in its entirety.	Proposed Plan Change 29 is significantly different in nature from the existing Nelson Resource Management Plan (NRMP) and the changes are certainly far greater than 'less than minor'. Council is not legally required under the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Mattes) Amendment Act (the Act) as a Tier 2 Council, to implement intensification and densification changes to its District Plan. We believe that Plan Change 29 is not consistent with these objectives and policies [from the NRMP as set out in the submission] 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. For the majority of homeowners investment in their home is by far their largest asset. To propose changes that will occur randomly and potentially affect the value of their asset is an action of the Council which ignores the needs of the existing residents [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 5
2195	S562.002	Hugh Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reconsider Proposed Plan Change 29 densification and intensification of the City and whether the Council (as a Tier 2 council) has a legal obligation to make this Plan Change 29 at this time.	Refer to the reasons in S562.001.	Reject	Section 12
2196	S562.004	Hugh Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	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.	The probability of developments occurring that affect us personally is likely (based on the information provided by Council of a development occurring is 15% of the rezoned residential areas) but the consequence is major. This creates a high risk profile for us that we should be able to manage but are unable to as complying developments will not require a resource consent. The only way that this risk can be managed under the proposed Plan Change is by the Council and you are proposing free rein to developers. We see this as a form of "Russian Roulette" that we would be made to live with knowing that anytime our lives could be changed without notice. The Pareto Management Principle 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. The parameters for identifying such sites should be included in the NRMP.	Reject	Section 12
2197	S562.005	Hugh Short	Residential Zones	Oppose	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 minimizing unintended or unacceptable consequences.	Reject	Section 13

2198	S562.006	Hugh Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Complete a Residential Spatial Plan that concentrates higher buildings in the Inner City and quickly reduces building heights as you radiate out from the Inner City, generally align with the height limits that currently exist under the NRMP and enable growth of compliant development in those areas through increased coverage or site specific allowed higher development.	For this process consider using a Collaborative Process that involves representatives with diverse views (e.g. Twyfords collaborative governance process "the Power of Co"), that tests the aims and objectives of the proposed Plan Change, using independent urban designers with input from the community (not just the Planners, community focus groups and others previously involved in preparation of this Plan Change 29).	Reject	Section 13
2199	S562.008	Hugh Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider and take account of the effect of Plan Change 29 outcomes as it affects the environment through avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment and in particular those effects on people and communities.	We appreciate that the City's population will grow over time and the impacts and requirements from this need to be managed and enabled in a planned way and suggest consideration by Council of the following: [in summary] a. The highly regarded Pareto Management Principle (80:20 rule) appears to have been ignored. b. There appears to be no spatial planning concept behind the proposed Plan Change. We will not end up with a well-designed City by pure chance. c. Any rational change would concentrate higher buildings in the Inner City and quickly reduce building heights as you radiate out from the Inner City. [Refer to point 7. 'Delivery of a well-designed City' in the original submission for rmore detail]	Reject	Section 13
2200	S562.009	Hugh Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Introduce an Urban Design Panel to work with and assist developers create good quality design outcomes in keeping with the City's form.	We and the majority of other Nelson residents that we have spoken with confirm that they live in Nelson because of its unique character. That consists of a mix of heritage buildings, generally low rise (maximum 2 storeys) residential development, flora and fauna in abundance and access to sunshine in their homes throughout the year. For the majority of homeowners investment in their home is by far their largest asset. To propose changes that will occur randomly and potentially affect the value of their asset is an action of the Council which ignores the needs of the existing residents. Nelson's unique character needs to be considered along with the proposed intensification. To do this good quality design led solutions need to occur that match as best it can with the current character. To have some independence in this process an Urban Design Panel should be established that works with developers from the project initiation stage and throughout the process to achieve this outcome.	Reject	Section 13
2201	S562.010	Hugh Short	Areas outside of the Plan Change	Oppose	Include planning for development in areas excluded from Plan Change 29 e.g. The Wood by enabling development to occur that considers and mitigates the effects of known natural hazards and provides appropriate residential solutions that enable intensification and densification in these zones also.	This development would support greater use of bus transport due to its close proximity to the Inner City and the relocated Bus Hub at the river's edge.	Reject	Section 13
2202	S562.011	Hugh Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Take a progressively phased approach by firstly allowing intensification in the Inner City Centre and City Fringe area (where 80 % of such development will occur) and allow increased two storey development on appropriate sized sites throughout the rest of the city.	Opportunities for greater high rise development in the Residential Zone (greater than two storeys) could be introduced when these type of developments are known to be required. This would occur following more robust assessment to define specific areas and appropriate controls for this type of development.	Reject	Section 10

2203	S562.019	Hugh Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Adhere to its Principles of Engagement as set out in Council's Significance and Engagement Policy by, in particular listening and considering views in an open and honest way and respecting everyone's point of view.	Proposed Plan Change 29 is significantly different in nature from the existing Nelson Resource Management Plan (NRMP) and the changes are certainly far greater than 'less than minor'. Mayor Nick Smith has stated publicly that Plan Change 29 is "the biggest changes in Nelson's planning rules in a generation" and would have a "huge impact on the shape of the city". It is therefore imperative that this trigger the Higher Significance requirement of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy due to the impact on the community, how many people are affected and by how much. Council would have had a reasonable expectation that this change would generate public interest and needs to adhere to its Principles of Engagement as set out in that policy.	Reject	Section 5
2204	S563.001	Meagan O'Brien	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	I would like you to delete the whole plan as it stands and start again.	So that a future plan is embraced by the community and the plan enhances Nelson and all of its residents culturally, economically, socially, psychologically and spiritually... [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
2205	S563.002	Meagan O'Brien	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Development] should not be done in a way that takes away from the people already living in those areas.	While I agree that everyone should have a healthy affordable home to live in, the way about doing this should not be done in a way that takes away from the people already living in those areas. Some of the negative impacts that this has on the current residents are: a. Financial insecurity... it is known that living next to a high rise building will lower the resale value of the home... b. increased heating bills... c. No-one moved to Nelson for the reason that they liked high-rise buildings... d. Connection to nature is an important part of wellbeing... Looking at a concrete building makes me feel claustrophobic and increases anxiety... [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
2206	S563.008	Meagan O'Brien	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Identify areas for intensification in rural areas where there aren't already residents living.	I suggest that areas are identified for intensification that will have the LEAST IMPACT. That is where there aren't already residents living who will be affected. Areas where people CHOOSE to live because they want to live in areas of high density housing. If there are people who will be affected, then compensating them accordingly... I suggest that a de-centralised approach is encouraged. Instead of trying to make space for millions more in central Nelson, encourage small town growth by supporting businesses that can offer employment opportunities so that people can live and work rurally if they wish. Schools like Dovedale school are almost closing because of lack of students. Focus on re-vitalising these areas. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12
2207	S563.011	Meagan O'Brien	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Don't alow people who live overseas and aren't a resident buy property.	That would make it easier for kiwis to buy their own home.	Reject	Section 9
2208	S563.012	Meagan O'Brien	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Limit the number of houses that people can own.	I think a limit to the number of houses that people can own would also help- how many houses does each person really need? and how many are remaining empty while others sleep on the street?	Reject	Section 12
2209	S564.001	Helen McCubbin	Mapping	Oppose in part	Change the Tahunanui hill side to General Residential Zone, not Medium and High Density Residential Zone.	I do not agree with building multiple storey buildings on a hillside which might compromise the slope stability and increase the risk of slips. The roads around the neighborhood are certainly not great for street parking, they are very narrow and increasing housing density would then increase the need for more street parking. There have been traffic calming measures put in place because of the traffic which has been great and has certainly reduced traffic flow. I also have concerns about the stormwater and how that would cope with greater density of housing.	Accept	Section 12

2210	FS61.075	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- I do not agree with building multiple storey buildings on a hillside which might compromise the slope stability and increase the risk of slips. The roads around the neighborhood are certainly not great for street parking, they are very narrow and increasing housing density would then increase the need for more street parking. There have been traffic calming measures put in place because of the traffic which has been great and has certainly reduced traffic flow. I also have concerns about the stormwater and how that would cope with greater density of housing. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support The Tahunanui hillside should be changed to General Residential Zone, not Medium and High Density Residential Zone.	Accept in part	Section 12
2211	FS72.079	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- I do not agree with building multiple storey buildings on a hillside which might compromise the slope stability and increase the risk of slips. The roads around the neighborhood are certainly not great for street parking, they are very narrow and increasing housing density would then increase the need for more street parking. There have been traffic calming measures put in place because of the traffic which has been great and has certainly reduced traffic flow. I also have concerns about the stormwater and how that would cope with greater density of housing. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support The Tahunanui hillside should be changed to General Residential Zone, not Medium and High Density Residential Zone.	Accept in part	Section 12
2212	FS60.071	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- I do not agree with building multiple storey buildings on a hillside which might compromise the slope stability and increase the risk of slips. The roads around the neighborhood are certainly not great for street parking, they are very narrow and increasing housing density would then increase the need for more street parking. There have been traffic calming measures put in place because of the traffic which has been great and has certainly reduced traffic flow. I also have concerns about the stormwater and how that would cope with greater density of housing. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support The Tahunanui hillside should be changed to General Residential Zone, not Medium and High Density Residential Zone.	Accept in part	Section 12
2213	S565.001	James McPhie	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Undertake Individual area reviews to assess the possibilities of intensification.	Plan 29 in its current iteration I cannot support. Whilst I support intensification the study and plan presented: a) is not sympathetic with the majority of the surrounding that they are included in. b) Would appear to be blanket build based on bus routes and access to town. c) Has not given allowance for the necessary space for recreational area given the increased residents in the area d) Has not given allowance for the increased wastewater discharge. Individual area reviews should be undertaken to assess the possibilities of intensification... It is important to get the total planning correct as this is a once in a lifetime change which has significance on the future... By taking time to correctly plan intensification, starting from the centre and moving out as time and height allows, the planning of the 'Smart Little' city would be enhanced... [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10

2214	S565.005	James McPhie	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Intensify with affordable housing in the City Centre first.	As the City Centre dies from lack of visitors and quality shops it is that area that should be focused on. Getting affordable housing in the centre so that it becomes thriving rather than 6 story blocks in the middle of single units... By taking time to correctly plan intensification, starting from the centre and moving out as time and height allows, the planning of the 'Smart Little' city would be enhanced.	Reject	Section 10
2215	S567.001	Mary Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Adhere to its Principles of Engagement as set out in Council's Significance and Engagement Policy by, in particular listening and considering views in an open and honest wayand respecting everyone's point of view.	Proposed Plan Change 29 is significantly different in nature from the existing Nelson Resource Management Plan (NRMP) and the changes are certainly far greater than 'less than minor'. Mayor Nick Smith has stated publicly that Plan Change 29 is "the biggest changes in Nelson's planning rules in a generation" and would have a "huge impact on the shape of the city". It is therefore imperative that this trigger the Higher Significance requirement of Council's Significance and Engagement Policy due to the impact on the community, how many people are affected and by how much. Council would have had a reasonable expectation that this change would generate public interest and needs to adhere to its Principles of Engagement as set out in that policy.	Reject	Section 5
2216	S567.002	Mary Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reconsider Proposed Plan Change 29 densification and intensification of the Cityand whether the Council (as a Tier 2 council) has a legal obligation to make this PlanChange 29 at this time.	Council is not legally required under the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act (the Act) as a Tier 2 Council, to implement intensification and densification changes to its District Plan (Nelson Resource Management Plan). Plan Change 29 does not seem to have considered in full the requirement of 2 (c) as it relates to the Act's definition of the Environment [refer to point 3. in the original submission for more detail]. The current Nelson Resource Management Plan (NRMP) contains both objectives and policies that ensure this definition is considered in the Council's consideration of resource consent applications.	Reject	Section 9
2217	S567.003	Mary Short	Residential Zones	Oppose	Amend the proposed residential zones to two zones (one High Density Zone and theother General Residential Zone) i.e. a much smaller area for higher densityresidential construction centred in the current Inner City Centre and City Fringeareas,	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 9

2218	S567.004	Mary Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Align management of intensification and densification of development using thePareto Management Principle by looking for 20% of the area where 80% of thedevelopments will occur.	The probability of developments occurring that affect us personally is likely (based on the information provided by Council of a development occurring is 15% of the rezoned residential areas) but the consequence is major. This creates a high risk profile for us that we should be able to manage but are unable to as complying developments will not require a resource consent. The only way that this risk can be managed under the proposed Plan Change is by the Council and you are proposing free rein to developers. We see this as a form of "Russian Roulette" that we would be made to live with knowing that anytime our lives could be changed without notice. The Pareto Management Principle 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. The parameters for identifying such sites should be included in the NRMP.	Reject	Section 12
2219	S567.005	Mary Short	Residential Zones	Amend	Create a General Residential Zone that includes the remaining areas with the NRMPcurrent rules and allow for 3 unit intensification up to two storeys on some adequatelysized 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 minimizing unintended or unacceptable consequences.	Reject	Section 13
2220	S567.006	Mary Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Complete a Residential Spatial Plan that concentrates higher buildings in the InnerCity and quickly reduces building heights as you radiate out from the Inner City, generally align with the height limits that currently exist under the NRMP and enablegrowth of compliant development in those areas through increased coverage or site specific allowed higher development.	For this process consider using a Collaborative Process that involves representatives with diverse views (e.g. Twyfords collaborative governance process "the Power of Co"), that tests the aims and objectives of the proposed Plan Change, using independent urban designers with input from the community (not just the Planners, community focus groups and others previously involved in preparation of this Plan Change 29).	Accept in part	Section 13
2221	S567.007	Mary Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider and take account of the effect of Plan Change 29 outcomes as it affects theenvironment through avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment and in particular those effects on people andcommunities.	We appreciate that the City's population will grow over time and the impacts and requirements from this need to be managed and enabled in a planned way and suggest consideration by Council of the following: [in summary] a. The highly regarded Pareto Management Principle (80:20 rule) appears to have been ignored. b. There appears to be no spatial planning concept behind the proposed Plan Change. We will not end up with a well-designed City by pure chance. c. Any rational change would concentrate higher buildings in the Inner City and quickly reduce building heights as you radiate out from the Inner City. [Refer to point 7. 'Delivery of a well-designed City' in the original submission for rmore detail]	Reject	Section 13

2222	S567.008	Mary Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Introduce an Urban Design Panel to work with and assist developers create goodquality design outcomes in keeping with the City's form.	We and the majority of other Nelson residents that we have spoken with confirm that they live in Nelson because of its unique character. That consists of a mix of heritage buildings, generally low rise (maximum 2 storeys) residential development, flora and fauna in abundance and access to sunshine in their homes throughout the year. For the majority of homeowners investment in their home is by far their largest asset. To propose changes that will occur randomly and potentially affect the value of their asset is an action of the Council which ignores the needs of the existing residents. Nelson's unique character needs to be considered along with the proposed intensification. To do this good quality design led solutions need to occur that match as best it can with the current character. To have some independence in this process an Urban Design Panel should be established that works with developers from the project initiation stage and throughout the process to achieve this outcome.	Reject	Section 13
2223	S567.009	Mary Short	Areas outside of the Plan Change	Oppose	Include planning for development in areas excluded from Plan Change 29 e.g. TheWood by enabling development to occur that considers and mitigates the effects ofknown natural hazards and provides appropriate residential solutions that enableintensification and densification in these zones also.	This development would support greater use of bus transport due to its close proximity to the Inner City and the relocated Bus Hub at the river's edge.	Reject	Section 13
2224	S567.010	Mary Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Take a progressively phased approach by firstly allowing intensification in the InnerCity Centre and City Fringe area (where 80 % of such development will occur) andallow increased two storey development on appropriate sized sites throughout therest of the city.	Opportunities for greater high rise development in the Residential Zone (greater than two storeys) could be introduced when these type of developments are known to be required. This would occur following more robust assessment to define specific areas and appropriate controls for this type of development.	Reject	Section 10
2225	S567.012	Mary Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose Proposed Plan Change 29 in its entirety.	Proposed Plan Change 29 is significantly different in nature from the existing Nelson Resource Management Plan (NRMP) and the changes are certainly far greater than 'less than minor'. Council is not legally required under the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Mattes) Amendment Act (the Act) as a Tier 2 Council, to implement intensification and densification changes to its District Plan. We believe that Plan Change 29 is not consistent with these objectives and policies [from the NRMP as set out in the submission] 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. For the majority of homeowners investment in their home is by far their largest asset. To propose changes that will occur randomly and potentially affect the value of their asset is an action of the Council which ignores the needs of the existing residents [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 5
2226	S568.001	Seamus O'Brien	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Abandon PC29 and redraft a new proposal that takes into consideration the feedback from the residents whom the Council has been elected to represent.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S568.002.	Reject	Section 9

2227	S568.002	Seamus O'Brien	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2228	S568.003	Seamus O'Brien	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that al Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
2229	S568.004	Seamus O'Brien	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
2230	S568.010	Seamus O'Brien	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
2231	S568.011	Seamus O'Brien	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 12
2232	FS28.039	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 in part	Section 12
2233	S568.013	Seamus O'Brien	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
2234	S568.018	Seamus O'Brien	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S568.005 and S568.011.	Reject	Section 13

2235	S568.019	Seamus O'Brien	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2236	S568.027	Seamus O'Brien	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
2237	S569.002	Mark Sutherland	Mapping	Oppose in part	Remove the small area of rezoning to Medium and High Density on the Tahunanui hillside bordered by Stansell Avenue at the north, Rangiora Terrace to the east, Maire Street to the South and Tahunanui Drive to the west. Rezone to General Residential as per the adjacent hillsides.	The inclusion of a small island of medium and high density rezoning on the moderate to steep hillside does not seem to take into consideration that the topography of the hillside will exacerbate the impact of the relaxed daylight angles over nearby properties, not just neighbouring properties. A property sited at a higher elevation and complying with its own boundary angle may, due to hillside topography, have a greater impact than usual on a property one or two properties over which more often than not, will be at a lower elevation. Daylight angle restrictions applied to developments on flat ground sites would usually have less impact on adjacent properties than when the same restriction is applied to a development on a moderate to steep hillside where the ground level, the reference point for the restriction, varies so widely across a distance of just a property or two. Rezoning the above mentioned area to General Residential, rather than Medium and High Density, would still allow some intensification from the status quo, albeit with a reduced loss of daylight amenity.	Accept in part	Section 12
2238	FS61.076	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Rezoning the above mentioned area to General Residential, rather than Medium and High Density, would still allow some intensification from the status quo, albeit with a reduced loss of daylight amenity. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Totally agree with Downgrading the proposed Tahunanui Hills High Density Zone to Medium Density. Add a High Density zone at the lowest levels - adjacent to Tahunanui drive/Annesbrook Drive.	Accept in part	Section 12
2239	FS72.080	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Rezoning the above mentioned area to General Residential, rather than Medium and High Density, would still allow some intensification from the status quo, albeit with a reduced loss of daylight amenity. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Totally agree with Downgrading the proposed Tahunanui Hills High Density Zone to Medium Density. Add a High Density zone at the lowest levels - adjacent to Tahunanui drive/Annesbrook Drive.	Accept in part	Section 12

2240	FS60.072	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Rezoning the above mentioned area to General Residential, rather than Medium and High Density, would still allow some intensification from the status quo, albeit with a reduced loss of daylight amenity. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Totally agree with Downgrading the proposed Tahunanui Hills High Density Zone to Medium Density. Add a High Density zone at the lowest levels - adjacent to Tahunanui drive/Annesbrook Drive.	Accept in part	Section 12
2241	S571.001	Tim Fraser-Harris	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Review the overall plan change and re-define the zones with a less extensive and more targeted approach.	Overall, I support the concept of intensification of residential development in and around the city centre. It will have economic, social, and environmental benefits. However, I feel that the zones as currently defined are not sufficiently well thought out. I feel that a more targeted approach might have resulted in less public outcry, and better outcomes. Expecting ~15% of areas to be developed shows how poorly targeted the plan is. I feel that a large number of residents will be 'living in fear' of a large development going ahead on their boundary. However, due to other factors (financial, geotech, social etc...) only a smaller number will actually be affected and probably not for some time. However, this plan change puts a large number of residents into the unknown and creates a perceived risk. Concentrating on smaller areas, with a higher % of expected development could achieve the same levels of residential accommodation provision as mandated by central government. Would adding a requirement to any commercial development in the Inner City Zone to include residential units / apartments on upper levels be an option? I note that new buildings in the Commercial Zones will still require a Resource Consent. This is the area that I feel we should be targeting first for intensification, and we should be encouraging development by providing provisions within the Plan to build and develop as a permitted activity, subject to meeting certain requirements/controls of course.	Accept in part	Section 9
2242	S571.002	Tim Fraser-Harris	Mapping	Amend	Downgrade the proposed Tahunanui Hills High Density Zone to Medium Density. Add a High Density zone at the lowest levels - adjacent to Tahunanui drive/Annesbrook Drive.	I would imagine that the geotech and engineering costs could render development un-viable for a large parts of the identified area anyway, but I am not sure why the higher parts of area has been included - eg. up to the Tosswill/Tamaki intersection. The implications of the proposed Maximum Building Height and Daylight Admission rule changes on new buildings in the proposed Zone would be a dramatic change for the area - especially with regard to sunlight and views. In winter, the hillside behind means that it takes the sun a while to get up. Adding an up to 19.5m building to the north of a property in this zone would mean greatly reduced sunlight in winter, making for cold, damp, unhealthy properties. Adding an up to 19.5m building to the north or west of a property could entirely block another property's view. I feel that any High Density Zone in the vicinity should be limited to the strip adjacent to Tahunanui Drive from Bisley Ave through to Douglas Road, where taller buildings would have less negative impacts on neighbouring properties and would allow better outlooks than achieved by the current buildings. Multiple use developments should be encouraged.	Reject	Section 12
2243	FS61.077	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support in part	Accept in part	The Particular Part of the submission I support in part/:- Removal of HDZ on Tahunanui hills. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support in part: removal of HDZ on the Tahunanui hills.	Accept in part	Section 12
2244	FS72.081	Jude Osborne		Support in part	Accept in part	The Particular Part of the submission I support in part/:- Removal of HDZ on Tahunanui hills. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support in part: removal of HDZ on the Tahunanui hills.	Accept in part	Section 12

2245	FS60.073	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support in part	Accept in part	The Particular Part of the submission I support in part/:- Removal of HDZ on Tahunanui hills. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support in part: removal of HDZ on the Tahunanui hills.	Accept in part	Section 12
2246	S572.001	Nelson Tasman Housing Trust	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Support the objective of the proposed Plan Change 29, to enable greater housing intensification in key parts of Nelson.	The Nelson Tasman Housing Trust (NTHT) sees the need for social and affordable housing every day: - There are over 100 people on our waitlist - We handle almost 200 queries about housing every year - Our latest survey of housing need in this region shows almost 700 households need affordable housing, in addition to the 423 households on the government's Housing Register Nelson and all of New Zealand has a real housing crisis. Many factors over the past 30 years have brought us to this point, and restrictive Council planning rules are one factor. Other key factors include drastic reduction of government investment in building housing since 1990, substantial population growth, increased building standards , higher construction costs, tax settings, and resource management requirements. NTHT supports the objective of Plan Change 29, because our community needs more housing. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 9
2247	FS56.077	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support	Accept	Kainga Ora agrees there is a need for additional housing in Nelson, and the waitlist for public housing is increasing. Kāinga Ora is also supportive of PC29. Intensifying housing near commercial centres and along public transport routes aligns with Policy 5 of the NPS-UD and would encourage more affordable, homes within easy reach of the city centre where people have more options to use active transport modes and public transport to access their daily needs, in turn supporting a quality compact urban form and a well-functioning environment.	Accept in part	Section 13
2248	S572.003	Nelson Tasman Housing Trust	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Enable/ prioritise intensification on flat land [inferred].	Nelson has a limited amount of flat land where it is easiest and most economical to build, and we need to make the best use of it.	Accept in part	Section 12
2249	FS56.079	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support	Accept	Kāinga Ora also supports intensification on flat land free of significant hazard risk.	Accept in part	Section 13
2250	S572.004	Nelson Tasman Housing Trust	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Enable/ prioritize housing near commercial centres and along public transport routes [inferred].	Intensifying housing near commercial centres and along public transport routes makes good sense.	Accept in part	Section 12
2251	FS18.004	Rodney Albertyn, Principal Planner, NZ Transport Agency		Support	Accept	NZTA supports residential intensification near commercial centres and along public transport routes. Specifically, the Central City, Tāhunanui and Stoke, all of which have easy access to public transport.	Accept	Section 12
2252	S572.005	Nelson Tasman Housing Trust	Entire Plan Change	Support	Enable/ prioritise planning to adapt to climate change [inferred].	Planning to adapt to climate change makes good sense.	Accept in part	Section 13
2253	S572.007	Nelson Tasman Housing Trust	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Ensure Plan Change 29 works in accordance with the development areas identified within the Nelson Tasman Future Development Study 2022-2052 (FDS).	We also understand that Council must meet its intensification and capacity requirements under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPSUD). Our recommendations regarding Plan Change 29 is to work in accordance with the development areas identified within the Nelson Tasman Future Development Study 2022-2052 (FDS).	Reject	Section 12
2254	S572.008	Nelson Tasman Housing Trust	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Provide for neighbourhood plans for key intensification areas, as referenced in the FDS.	Provide for neighbourhood plans for key intensification areas, as referenced in the FDS, so there is a process to address peoples' concerns and create sensible, attractive spatial plans. Remember a key aim is to strengthen the whole community by enabling new housing that integrates well with the community.	Reject	Section 13

2255	S572.009	Nelson Tasman Housing Trust	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Support the Nelson planning rules to enable more terraced housing and apartments up to 6 stories, in specific zones, with protections for daylight angles.	We agree it makes sense to adjust the Nelson planning rules to enable more terraced housing and apartments up to 6 stories, in specific zones, with protections for daylight angles. We understand the impact of these changes will only take effect over time. Some of the homes generated will be at the high end, we aim to contribute more at the affordable level. We acknowledge the community and economic benefits of generating more homes will only evolve over many years.	Accept in part	Section 12
2256	S573.004	David Allan	Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove the proposed High Density Zone on the Tahuna Hills entirely from PC29 and any future District Plans.	I oppose the proposed HDZ in the Tahuna Hills area as the land is not fit-for-purpose due to several factors. I ask the Council to remove Tahuna Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ because of ongoing and well documented slope instability in this area. The area also lacks suitable infrastructure (narrow roads with limited footpaths and parking). Council has just done an excellent job in traffic calming the key hill route (Stansell, Tosswill & Chamberlain) that will be required to carry an increased traffic load from this intensification with the proposed HDZ and the proposed MDZ zone as well. This will directly and adversely impact on the safety of all modes of road users in the area. The lack of the essential amenities, there are no supermarkets or public transport within easy walking distance. There is also a significant risk of slips directly caused by intensification development particularly when coupled with the climate change impacts of more frequent and extreme weather events.	Accept in part	Section 12
2257	FS61.040	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: I oppose the proposed HDZ in the Tahuna Hills area as the land is not fit-for-purpose due to several factors. I ask the Council to remove Tahuna Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ because of ongoing and well documented slope instability in this area. The area also lacks suitable infrastructure (narrow roads with limited footpaths and parking). The reasons for my support - Only have to look at August rain events to see the Tahunanui hills and other hills in Nelson aren't suitable for HDZ.	Accept in part	Section 12
2258	FS72.043	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: I oppose the proposed HDZ in the Tahuna Hills area as the land is notfit-for-purpose due to several factors. I ask the Council to remove Tahuna Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ because of ongoing and well documented slope instability in this area. The area also lacks suitable infrastructure (narrow roads with limited footpaths and parking). The reasons for my support - Only have to look at August rain events to see the Tahunanui hills and other hills in Nelson aren't suitable for HDZ.	Accept in part	Section 12
2259	FS60.035	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support. I oppose the proposed HDZ in the Tahuna Hills area as the land is not fit-for-purpose due to several factors. I ask the Council to remove Tahuna Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ because of ongoing and well documented slope instability in this area. The area also lacks suitable infrastructure (narrow roads with limited footpaths and parking). The reasons for my support - Only have to look at August rain events to see the Tahunanui hills and other hills in Nelson aren't suitable for HDZ.	Accept in part	Section 12

2260	S573.006	David Allan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Appoint independent hearing Commissioners.	I have found the lack of early public engagement and consultation on Plan Change 29 surprising and unsatisfactory. For example, we will be affected by our property in the Tāhunanui Hills being zoned medium density with potential for 12m high buildings on our neighbouring properties. We only found out about the plan change by chance through a friend . There was no letter or email from the Nelson City Council to us as a directly impacted party. We have still received nothing by email or letter from the Council about the proposed change plan to our property. This is a Council-led plan change and it is prudent for Council to appoint independent hearing Commissioners to ensure best practice process is now put in place.	Reject	Section 13
2261	S573.007	David Allan	Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove the Medium Density Residential Zone from the entire Tahuna Hills active and passive slump area and replace with the General Residential Zone.	We ask the Council to remove Tahuna Hills from the proposed MDZ and make it GRZ because of ongoing and well-documented slope instability in this area. We oppose the proposed MDZ in the Tahuna Hills slump area as the land is not fit-for-purpose due to several factors. In the recent flooding event in August 2022 we had 2 slips on neighbouring properties. There is also a significant risk of slips directly caused by intensification 3 level developments particularly when coupled with the climate change impacts of more frequent and extreme weather events. I ask the Council to remove Tahuna Hills from the proposed MDZ and make it GRZ because of ongoing and well-documented slope instability in this area. The area also lacks suitable infrastructure (narrow roads with limited footpaths and parking). Council has just done an excellent job in traffic calming the key hill route (Stansell, Tosswill & Chamberlain) that will be required to carry an increased traffic load from this intensification with the proposed MDZ and the proposed HDZ zone as well. This will directly and adversely impact on the safety of all modes of road users in the area. The area also lacks essential amenities, there are no supermarkets or public transport within easy walking distance.	Accept	Section 12
2262	S576.001	Dominic Alford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S576.002.	Reject	Section 13
2263	S576.002	Dominic Alford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2264	S576.003	Dominic Alford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
2265	S576.004	Dominic Alford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
2266	S576.006	Dominic Alford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S576.005.	Reject	Section 13

2267	S576.010	Dominic Alford	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
2268	S576.011	Dominic Alford	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 12
2269	FS28.040	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 in part	Section 12
2270	S576.018	Dominic Alford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S576.005 and S576.011.	Reject	Section 13
2271	S576.019	Dominic Alford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the Residential Zones [up to] Medium Density (3 storey 11m high) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties, [followed by] the City Fringe and Inner City.	Firstly, the Residential Zones would be the area I would support Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) if required and over time, provided AP 15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Inner City should be the final place for intensification, this can give more time to complete a better design vision after viewing what needs adjusting to our residential neighbourhoods. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2272	S576.027	Dominic Alford	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
2273	S576.029	Dominic Alford	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2274	S576.030	Dominic Alford	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2275	S577.001	Adrienne Alford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S577.002.	Reject	Section 13

2276	S577.002	Adrienne Alford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2277	S577.003	Adrienne Alford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
2278	S577.004	Adrienne Alford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
2279	S577.006	Adrienne Alford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S577.005.	Reject	Section 13
2280	S577.010	Adrienne Alford	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
2281	FS28.041	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 in part	Section 12
2282	S577.011	Adrienne Alford	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 12
2283	S577.018	Adrienne Alford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S577.005 and S577.011.	Reject	Section 13
2284	S577.019	Adrienne Alford	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the Residential Zones [up to] Medium Density (3 storey 11m high) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties, [followed by] the City Fringe and Inner City.	Firstly, the Residential Zones would be the area I would support Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) if required and over time, provided AP 15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Inner City should be the final place for intensification, this can give more time to complete a better design vision after viewing what needs adjusting to our residential neighbourhoods. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10

2285	S577.027	Adrienne Alford	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
2286	S577.029	Adrienne Alford	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2287	S577.030	Adrienne Alford	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2288	S578.001	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Take Nelsonians on a journey through the Plan Change process. Acknowledge that this a big decision, make sure you adequately involve residents. e.g. Wellington did a round of submissions on a draft plan.	My submission is based on the few things I've read, a quick glance at the e-plan, and a 30 minute phone conversation with Emily Bayliss... This is the first time I've made a real submission. My first - and probably most important - feedback is that there is too much information for someone who works full-time to read. It's also far too complicated to understand... The e-plan was somewhat useful but you need to come up with better ways to communicate with the public. Some of my ideas are: workshops or online seminars... YouTube videos... more information in the Our Nelson paper with regular, bite-size updates on what's been discussed and decided... a short overview of what you're generally trying to achieve (goals/outcomes) and some bullet points of the strategies you're employing (or your proposed changes) to do so... Images are really helpful... We are faced with a housing a crisis and the need for more dwellings is urgent, but we've got to do this right - acknowledge that this plan change is a big decision and make sure you adequately inform and involve residents before going ahead with changes. As an example, I believe Wellington did a round of submissions on a draft plan. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
2289	S578.002	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Support "going up [Intensification] not out [greenfield devleopment]" (with caveats/concerns).	Not stated.	Accept in part	Section 12
2290	S578.003	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Focus on the CBD first.	Focus on replacing/upgrading the CBD before spreading attention further. The CBD has been in dire need of attention for far too long. Apart from upper Trafalgar Street, there is nowhere particularly inviting for people to go and it desperately needs revitalisation in terms of intensification of dwellings but also accessibility through public and active transport, affordable spaces for businesses and public spaces attract people into town. For this reason, intensification of dwellings in the CBD needs to happen in lockstep with a larger plan to revitalise the entire CBD. I think the redevelopment of Ōtautahi Christchurch's CBD should be used as a guide. It's harder to start with a blank slate of course but we can still learn a lot from how that rebuild occurred to create a bustling and characterful city centre. I want these plan changes to coincide with an increase in public transport; active transport corridors, and green spaces.	Reject	Section 10

2291	S578.005	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Residential Zones	Support	Implement General Residential Zone as soon as possible.	I support implementing the General Residential Zone (GRZ) in as many areas as possible as soon as possible. I understand the 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. If that's the case, do it! Let's put the lawnmower away and put some dwellings there!	Accept in part	Section 12
2292	S578.006	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Draw up neighbourhood plans outlining specific design goals for each area.	Draw up neighbourhood plans outlining specific design goals for each area (e.g. accessibility and transport corridors - especially active - around and through the area, incorporating and/or enhancing natural environment elements, increasing preserving heritage and character of an area, integrating climate change strategies (e.g increasing soft landscaping to absorb moisture), etc). It's really important we have overall plans for each neighbourhood/zone so we're not just working on a disconnected site-by-site basis. It doesn't take many ugly developments to ruin a place! I don't think any plans changes should come into force until that material has been developed and approved - perhaps with the exception of the GRZs -although it's still pertinent that neighbourhood plans for those zones are created.	Reject	Section 13
2293	S578.008	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Coincide the Plan Change with an increase in public transport; active transport corridors, and green space.	I don't believe the current plan change 29 adequately canvases these themes and would like to see more thought around including them in the plan so we don't miss important opportunities to build necessary infrastructure or allocate spaces for greening or public use.	Reject	Section 11
2294	S578.009	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Don't abandon [the plan change], modify it.	I think, overall, there has been under-development for far too long and plan changes like this have been thrown in the too-hard basket for decades. We're now faced in the situation where it's no longer an option to make changes - it's being forced on us by a housing crisis, we're not prepared for it and this council is baring the full brunt of decades of ignorance and a previous lack of political (and public) willpower. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12
2295	S578.014	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Residential Zones	Amend	Consider amending the maximum building heights in the Medium and High Density Residnetial Zones [inferred].	Building heights - the tall stuff needs a bit more deep thinking and public involvement.	Accept in part	Section 12
2296	S578.024	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Support the development of a regional urban development agency to provide guidance and oversee development across Nelson so it occurs in a more coordinated way. I wonder if some kind of fee could be paid when developing or altering a of land section (relative to its size and how many dwellings) to help support the existence such an agency.	Refer to reasons in submission point S578.018.	Reject	Section 13
2297	S579.004	Dee Taylor	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 S579.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2298	S579.006	Dee Taylor	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones. Allow high density in central and city fringe but where there is single storey housing there should be NO multi-storey, to protect daylight angles and sunlight.	Refer to reasons in submission points S579.001 and S579.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12

2299	S579.011	Dee Taylor	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S579.009 and S579.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
2300	S579.012	Dee Taylor	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Delete high density zones in single storey residential areas].	Multi-storey development has no place amongst single storey housing.	Reject	Section 12
2301	S579.013	Dee Taylor	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Delete medium density zones in single storey residential areas].	Multi-storey development has no place amongst single storey housing.	Reject	Section 12
2302	S579.018	Dee Taylor	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Undertake] a comprehensive study identifying sites around town and how these could be developed in a cohesive way. The study should be design driven, not by developers. Re-plan high density zones, especially with regard to multi-storey.	The new zoning of areas for high density residential seems to be haphazard. The town needs to be well planned looking at utilising empty large sites around the town. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject in part	Section 12
2303	S579.019	Dee Taylor	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reduce resource consent fees for small scale development.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 9
2304	S579.020	Dee Taylor	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Instead of multi-storey, [consider] large scale terraced housing with parking and communal gardens.	Houses could be mixed sizes to accommodate a balance of society - families, retired, and single people. This kind of design might produce some affordable housing.	Accept in part	Section 12
2305	S580.001	Small Time Developments	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the intent of Plan Change 29.	Overall, we strongly support the intent of Plan Change 29 and congratulate the Council for its intent to enable the intensification of housing in the residential areas of the city.	Accept in part	Section 9
2306	S580.002	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Support	Support the new General Residential Zone.	Not stated. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
2307	S580.003	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Support	Support the new Medium Density Residential Zone.	Not stated. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
2308	S580.004	Small Time Developments	Residential Zones	Support	Support the new High Density Residential Zone.	Not stated. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12
2309	S581.001	Hilary Kirby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw the Plan Change prior to further submissions. If it is not withdrawn then reject it, Alternatively, make the amendments to the Plan Change as set out in the submission.	Refer to reasons in submission points S581.002 - S581.013.	Reject	Section 13
2310	S581.005	Hilary Kirby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Property owners who will be directly affected bytheir property's zone being changed, be notified by email, letter, or mail drop.	Essentially, not all Nelson property owners are aware of PC29, or it's implications, on their property and their tenants. I have found it difficult to digest the total content of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. There has been a lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council, with its severe implications towards the well-being of existing rate paying residents enjoyment of their properties, extremely stressful and unnecessary. [Refer to point 2 on page 4 in the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2311	S581.006	Hilary Kirby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent hearing panel; and if that is not possible appoint Councilors from either side of the Sept 14th vote, or that at least 2 additional, well qualified people, who are not current Councilors, are added to the Hearing Panel.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councilor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13

2312	S581.007	Hilary Kirby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUDCapacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirementsaccordingly.	Nelson City Council's population forecasts are a pivotal aspect for the scale of which Nelson needs to enable intensification and growth. The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
2313	S581.008	Hilary Kirby	Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential zone completely from the plan and apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district, 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.	It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate.	Accept in part	Section 12
2314	S581.011	Hilary Kirby	Infrastructure	Amend	[Seeks] the Council include plans to mitigate against future drought situations, the increased capacity requirements for waste water systems, and the increased capacity for storm water.	Mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population. Mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for storm water, particularly in the Stoke area as already mentioned -- where much of the central shopping area is already in the flood plain. If Council does not or is unwilling to provide the infrastructure required to allow for intensification, and instead stipulates that this must be paid for by developers, then the opportunities for development and intensification will not be equitable. This is because only large developers, social housing providers and government organisations like Kainga Ora, will be able to meet this extra cost. Other ratepayers will generally not be able to afford such a surcharge and therefore will not be able to develop their properties to help meet the need for intensification.	Reject	Section 11
2315	S581.012	Hilary Kirby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Identify and assess the social impact of PC29 and identify strategies that might mitigate anypotential affects associated with proposed Plan Change 29 on people's wellbeing and Nelson society in general.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2316	S582.002	Bill Harrington	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the need for an intensification plan change in Nelson generally.	There may be a range of well supported reasons for amendments to the zonings and provisions in specific areas made by other submitters, however the general premise of this plan change and advancing some form of intensification plan change is supported and long overdue in Nelson. Please note this submission is made in a personal capacity and not in any specific professional capacity as a planner. However from my experience consenting a considerable number of housing developments in Nelson the current density settings are at times out of step with what the market is seeking to deliver, and even well designed intensification can run into difficulties set against the currently out of date planning provisions and density settings, which are also not reflective of national direction to improve housing capacity and supply.	Accept in part	Section 9
2317	S583.004	Janet Matheson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Delete the] High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 12 m.	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 S583.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2318	S583.006	Janet Matheson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S583.001 and S583.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12

2319	S583.007	Janet Matheson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2320	S583.008	Janet Matheson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the Closing Date for Submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2321	S583.012	Janet Matheson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Allow buildings of 3 storeys plus to be developed on the edge of town.	There is room to build 3 - 6 storeys in many places around the edges of the city without overwhelming existing homes in the city streets.	Accept in part	Section 12
2322	S584.001	Noeline Vincent	Residential Zones	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29 in its entirety.	Plan Change 29 would change Nelson from the vibrant but safe city that so many of us have loved to live in for most of our lives. It would affect the safe quiet residential areas families and communities have sort out to call home. The anxiety of the possibility of a 6 storey block of appartments going up on our boundary along with the accompanying noise, pollution, and lack of private outdoor areas to socialize, and safe outside areas for children to develop their co-ordination skills. [Refer to Page 1 in the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 9
2323	S585.001	Rosemary Cooke	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Cancel Plan 29.	Plan29 negative effect on Nelson's Character and health of the citizens: Nelson residents have ranked the following among the top 6 preferences for housing: Sunny, freehold, stand alone, and adequate garaging or off street parking. Plan29 housing is unlikely to meet these requirements. Design should be led by awareness of environmental impacts (e.g. solar shading, concrete) and allow residents of all abilities to interact with nature in or from their living space (eg. green views, yard space). Nelson needs to focus on family friendly housing to attract stable, long term citizens who will contribute to the local community and economy.	Reject	Section 9
2324	S585.003	Rosemary Cooke	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Prioritise intensification within the Inner City before introducing it to established residential neighbourhoods].	A better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods could be developed when the inner city comes under population pressure. Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before introducing it to established residential neighbourhoods.	Accept in part	Section 12
2325	S585.005	Rosemary Cooke	Mapping	Oppose	Delete the high density zone from the plan change [inferred].	I am against high density housing in Nelson because the building of quality apartments is currently too expensive to provide well designed mid to low cost housing. Therefore developers will need to use cheaper "pack and stack" designs and take shortcuts with materials to make a profit. Several Kainga ora multi one bedroom unit housing blocks are unhealthy examples of low cost housing which can increase crime, insecurity and isolation amongst vulnerable tenants.	Accept in part	Section 12
2326	S585.007	Rosemary Cooke	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	NCC's Population forecasts are questionable These are a pivotal aspect for the scale of which Nelson needs to enable intensification and growth.	Reject	Section 10

2327	S587.001	Change PC 29 Incorporated	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	OPPOSE the Plan Change in its totality; AND SEEK the withdrawal of the Plan Change by Council prior to the calling of Further Submissions, AND (if Council does not withdraw it accordingly) SEEK dismissal/cancellaton by the Commissioner and/or the Council.	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. The whole basis for the Plan Change (i.e. the expected increase in population) is false and Council did not rely sufficiently on Statistics NZ figures. There have been no neighbourhood meetings or consultation with neighbourhoods as recommended in the Future Development Strategy adopted in August 2022 by Council. I (i.e. my Members) ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it difficult (in fact impossible) to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages. I CONSIDER that some of the publicity coming out of Council (in relation to the Plan Change) has been positively misleading. I HOPE that more qualified citizens will make more comprehensive Submissions covering my concerns as to ongoing protection of existing views and access to sunlight: for all residential occupiers; and absence of any encouragement to provide parking.	Reject	Section 9
2328	FS31.005	Stephen Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Oppose PC29 in its totality. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2329	FS78.009	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission I support are: Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives. This is not sustainable, precautionary planning. The Plan Change is not informed by adequate information or analysis. Provisions for intensification are based on quantitative not qualitative measures. PPC29 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 12
2330	FS72.005	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Oppose PC29 in its totality. This plan is out of step with the NZ Central Government's proposed plans for development. The NZ Government has indicated a lack of support for the previous Government's position on densification. Until more direction is given, this has the potential to be a waste of Council and Ratepayers' funds and time following an outdated Central Government brief. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13

2331	FS66.007	Carol Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Oppose PC29 in its totality. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2332	FS61.005	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Oppose PC29 in its totality. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2333	FS76.005	Robert Stevenson(1)		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Oppose PC29 in its totality. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2334	FS54.005	Nicole Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Oppose PC29 in its totality. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2335	FS53.005	Susan Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Oppose PC29 in its totality. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2336	FS46.005	Dan McGuire		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Oppose PC29 in its totality. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2337	FS77.005	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Oppose PC29 in its totality. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13

2338	FS58.005	Robert Stevenson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Oppose PC29 in its totality. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2339	FS60.005	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Oppose PC29 in its totality. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2340	S587.002	Change PC 29 Incorporated	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the creation of a High Density Residential Zone.	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. THE GROUNDS/REASONS for my opposition include all other grounds set out in other Submissions opposing the whole theory of High Density Zone. I FURTHER OPPOSE the stated justification for the proposal for a HDZ, • the proposed recession planes; • the starting heights for recession planes • the angle of recession; • permitted heights in excess of 10 metres in any Residential Zones; set out in the papers supporting the proposed PC 29, and the absence of any detailed comment as to the visual and amenity effect on neighbouring and neighbourhood properties of permitted height of 19.5 metres, and recession plane only commencing at 12 metres.	Accept in part	Section 12
2341	S587.012	Change PC 29 Incorporated	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel (ie no present Councillors) to hear the Submissions, if the Plan Change is to proceed in any form.	Refer to reasons in submission point S587.001.	Reject	Section 13
2342	FS31.016	Stephen Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an Independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
2343	FS78.006	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Panel members should be impartial. The Hearing Panel makeup needs to be reviewed due to perceived conflicts of interest. Perception of bias on Panel due to part support of Plan Change.	Reject	Section 13
2344	FS72.016	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an Independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
2345	FS66.018	Carol Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an Independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
2346	FS61.016	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an Independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
2347	FS76.016	Robert Stevenson(1)		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an Independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
2348	FS54.016	Nicole Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an Independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
2349	FS53.016	Susan Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an Independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13

2350	FS46.016	Dan McGuire		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an Independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
2351	FS77.016	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an Independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
2352	FS58.016	Robert Stevenson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an Independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
2353	FS60.016	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Appoint an Independent Hearing Panel. The public perception that the council members on the panel have a predetermined bias.	Reject	Section 13
2354	S589.019	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend REr.18l as follows: REr.18l Fences 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.18l 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 11
2355	FS68.008	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend REr.18l 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 11
2356	FS69.012	Ryman Healthcare Limited		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend REr.18l 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 11
2357	S591.001	Kent Inglis	Entire Plan Change	Support	Adopt Proposed Plan Change 29, with changes as requested in submission points S591.002 - S591.010.	As the owner of > 20 residential units (including @ 50% being social housing) in the inner city and suburban commercial zone, I can attest to the need for additional housing units, including a need for smaller units given changing demographics. I believe that Proposed Plan Change 29 will give rise to the ability to construct such units. I also believe that the encouraging higher density development within proximity to the city centre and on public transport routes will add vitality to the city and reduce roading congestion. The creation of additional housing units will reduce demand/pressure on rental housing stocks. Proposed Plan change 29 addresses these issues.	Accept	Section 9
2358	S595.001	Graeme OBrien	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Object to plan change 29.	I wish to register my objection to parts of the Plan 29 change. I object to the changes because they are not in the best interests of the city or people of Nelson. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
2359	S596.001	Jennifer-Anne Fletcher	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject] the proposed new residential zones and retain the existing residential classifications.	New Zones especially HDRS is not suitable or necessary. To allow HDRZ in a residential zone will have detrimental effect on those areas in that: It will cause those areas particularly where there are older homes to lose their specific street character and landscape causing breakup of those areas by bulk buildings in those areas. The character and landscape need to be preserved in those areas. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12

2360	S596.003	Jennifer-Anne Fletcher	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Amend Plan Change 29 to allow graduated increased height in the inner city - centre zone. Generally, this graduated approach to be followed in all CBD /town areas merging with residential areas. Start with medium density at the inner-city fringe and increase to no more than 8 storeys inner city-centre.	Blanket height levels in the fringe and inner-city centre are unattractive and do not create a vibrant liveable city. The highest parts of the Rutherford hotel and clock tower detracts from the city-scape and do not integrate into the surrounding city-scape and are eyesores. A more subtle and graduated approach to building/ development is needed. Random development of levels of buildings and building closer into the streets will not provide a more vibrant or safer city.	Accept in part	Section 12
2361	S596.008	Jennifer-Anne Fletcher	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Make specific provision for greater green areas and landscaping with no reliance on existing green spaces or landscaping.	The inner city and centre need to ensure increased green spaces and landscaping of these areas with new development. There should not be reliance on existing green areas and landscaping. The city needs more of these areas not less or defused by more building to green space proportion.	Reject	Section 11
2362	S597.001	Stephanie Phillips	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Focus multi storey residential development in the Inner City Zones.	The plan change is too extensive to achieve urban density in the locations most critical to occur. The proposed plan change footprint as compared to Wellington City centre would extend the multistorey buildings to an area the equivalent from Thorndon, Wellington central & parliament through to and including Cuba and Courtney place. Nelson is not a city on this scale. Wellington has taken 150 years to have a CBD footprint and intensification of this scale. Indeed 100 years ago there were multistorey buildings in greater scale than Nelsons existing CBD. I believe this plan would also lead to disastrous unintended consequences. Acne type development. 4-6 storey buildings are commercial & expensive to build so will be built on cheapest land not in city centre. There are a limited client base for this type of construction and suitable residents. There are two new potential developers we should be cautious of - retirement villages and offshore non resident investors... Development in the city centre is unlikely to occur in any desirable time scale as the development footprint available is too large. We will end up with a few dotted in existing residential suburbs, driving adjacent residents out... Flood prone properties price inflation - Residents who want sunlight to their home will move to locations where light is protected. This could fuel a price boom in our coastal flood residential zones as these areas are not affected by the new rules. It is a feasibility that ratepayers in the future will be footing the bill to relocate residents in a future flood disaster - Council should not be driving a price boom in this area at this time. The city centre is begging for more intensive development. From previous consultation and attending public meetings, concerned residents appeared to generally support	Accept in part	Section 12
2363	S597.002	Stephanie Phillips	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 12

2364	S597.007	Stephanie Phillips	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Protect Nelson's existing residential character [inferred].	Loss of city character - Nelson has an eclectic heritage character with is typified by covering a range of housing eras. These are in conflict with a multistorey apartment buildings at 19.5m high 1m off a boundary. This leads to a typology that would be the loss of Nelson's heritage - it isn't a single street - Richmond Ave - Elliot St - Seymour Ave it is the streetscape as a whole that is the character of the city - mid century adjacent to 1850's along side 1920's Bungalow. We have been doing infill since the city began, but always in a similar scale. It is the collective whole that is the character of the city . This plan would destroy that character needlessly. If we embraced our existing scale we can proceed with infill that enhances our city. The RMA handbrake has been the 1 dwelling / 600m2 which is less dense than existing heritage models of South Street and Elliot Street. We already have a density model in the city as a template.	Accept in part	Section 12
2365	S597.008	Stephanie Phillips	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 12
2366	S597.026	Stephanie Phillips	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Build density review stages into the Plan Change to review the plan every 5-10 years for critical population targets as set out in this plan. Adjust the density provisions as required after these reviews.	Build in review stages - with population growth. This alternative proposal is based on the CBD being the primary population growth driver. Review every 5-10 years for critical population targets set out in this plan. Adjust as required. The proposed medium density rule could be brought in once the CBD hit a population of 2000 - to really focus development in this area first. The new general residential rules will kick start a huge amount of infill without a medium density rule in play.	Reject	Section 10
2367	S598.001	David Rees	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Restrict any high rise development to the CBD only.	I object to the PC29 change and the impact it would have on Nelson city. Any future high rise development should be carried out in the existing CBD where there are already high buildings. Building beyond 3 or even 2 storeys should not be necessary in general residential areas, especially on relatively flat land. If, in time, no further intensification became possible in the CBD growth should then spread out from the CBD as necessary. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
2368	S598.005	David Rees	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Carry out] a high level of consultation with the public before any changes are introduced.	I believe any changes to the city need to take into account the views of the citizens of Nelson and the council needs to listen seriously to the objections to steamrollering through PC29. The council is good at notifying citizens of road works, drainage works and other initiatives at a local level but PC29 impacts on every citizen in every part of the city. Elected councillors need to make their individual views very clear to voters. Concerning the residential zones, the categorisation of the density of areas seems quite arbitrary. In many cases one side of the street is in a different zone to the other. Also one questions why there needs to be no less than 8 different residential zoning categories.	Reject	Section 13
2369	S598.006	David Rees	Natural Hazards/Climate Change	Oppose	[Consider rezoning Glenduan for commercial and industrial purposes].	In the recent past there was talk of building houses on the extensive low-lying land at the Glen. There are obvious flooding risks here due to rising sea levels. However with land reclamation surely this could be zoned as an out-of-town commercial and industrial area releasing land in central Nelson, Stoke and Tahunanui for residential building.	Reject	Section 13

2370	S599.001	Dorothy Waygood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Revise the] current plan and follow the government's instructions on completing a tier 2 [city] plan.	Having lived for over 80 yrs I find myself confused and disappointed with the process the current council has taken with regard to Nelson Citys growth. Democracy is something generations of us have fought for. I am very disappointed to reach this junction in my life where the thoughts and best interests of the community are not considered by so few, temporary elected individuals. Their lack of respect is unforgivable. I disagree with all elements of Plan Change 29 and would like to be included in all aspects of the plan process.	Reject	Section 10
2371	S600.002	Katherine Mann and Michael Levy	Entire Plan Change	Amend	[Suggest council] address Climate Change ASAP not wait for CentralGovernment. The comments in the NRMP are modest at best, Key areas of our Cityare at risk and should be addressed....NOW.	This may be the most significant issue confronting our short-medium term future. Whether It be low-lying land at risk of flooding (The Wood, Maitai, Inner City) or the Tahuna Hills/Atawhai where torrential rain changed lives and homes for many a year or so ago. We have been told several times that this topic is off the agenda because the country (Central Government) must get its own act together before the City can respond. Risk reduction and proactive changes feel mission critical for many in our community. It should be right near the top of any agenda. - Small communities are able to deal with this...last week on Radio NZ a news item covered a small coastal town partnering with their Council to take significant action. - How can you make plans for the City when no one talks about the elephant In the room/on the table?....Climate Change needs action now.....please. - Many people have voiced a concern around what Is being done proactively on this matter. We agree. It Is very important so let's get on with some consultation and work here...like right now? Let's not kick that very wet can further down a future road?	Reject	Section 13
2372	FS61.059	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- How can you make plans for the City when no one talks about the elephant In the room/on the table?....Climate Change needs action now.....please. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- We believe we need to have a city wide response, as submitter mentioned still awaiting the NPS on Climate that was due late last year, with areas such as The Wood and Tahunanui flats left off until then w risk of Climate change in coastal areas.	Accept in part	Section 12
2373	FS72.063	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- How can you make plans for the City when no one talks about the elephant in the room/on the table?....Climate Change needs action now..... please. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- We believe we need to have a city wide response, as submitter mentioned still awaiting the NPS on Climate that was due late last year, with areas such as The Wood and Tahunanui flats left off until then w risk of Climate change in coastal areas.	Accept in part	Section 12
2374	FS60.055	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- How can you make plans for the City when no one talks about the elephant In the room/on the table?....Climate Change needs action now.....please. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- We believe we need to have a city wide response, as submitter mentioned still awaiting the NPS on Climate that was due late last year, with areas such as The Wood and Tahunanui flats left off until then w risk of Climate change in coastal areas.	Accept in part	Section 12

2375	S600.004	Katherine Mann and Michael Levy	Inner City and City Fringe Zones	Amend	[Seeks council] seriously reconsider the approach to High Rise -- prioritise the CBD and tackle it in astepwise approach. Be thoughtful about how best to implement this. Many citizenssupport this approach.	A vibrant city needs many aspects to It. High Rise is part of it. Character and accessibility to activities Is part of it. Nelson is a walkable City -- that Is a real plus. Everything feels like It Is 5-10 minutes walking distance. We support a Plan that thinks carefully and strategically about this. We support managed High Rise In the Inner City. - Can the Council play a financial role In starting some CBD accommodation projects - accommodation/high rise etc? Consider a staged approach to high rise rather than scatter everywhere? - We see less need for high rise outside the Inner City. For sure if that Is to happen there should at minimum be real limits on the number of high-rise buildings built there? It Is difficult for many people (younger and older) to afford to live reasonably In Nelson. Nelson is not unique to this issue across the country. This must be addressed and likely controlled High Rise is part of the answer.	Reject	Section 10
2376	S600.006	Katherine Mann and Michael Levy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Review the popoulation growth assumptions].	It is our understanding that population growth assumptions are relatively modest and are modelled on the past and projected from that basis. It appears that no consideration has been given to creating an inflection or disruption to that "growth" either to increase it (broadly or in specific sectors of the population) or to reduce it. It is our view that just allowing the population assumptions to stand (and thereby increase the number/share of older people) does little to contribute to relative growth from younger people who could bring so much to the city. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2377	S601.002	Julie Strange	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Employ more town planners and create a decent process.	Employ more town planners and create a decent process... Is this a money saving scheme you are trying to develop?... After speaking with Housing Nz about their potential developments in York and Boundary, Waimea Road (between Motueka and Tukuka) It appears some of these plans for 3 and 6 storied building are for the development they want to do in the near future...	Reject	Section 13
2378	S601.004	Julie Strange	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the high density zoning allowing 6 storey buildings, between Motueka and Tukuka St [inferred].	There should be no expectation to build a 6 storied building between Motueka and Tukuka st. In the area by the hospital. This is already a very congested area , its a thoroughfare for traffic into and out of Nelson. I am Trustee for my mother in this zone. Her part of the street has become very dangerous, getting in and out of her driveway hazardous. Too much traffic too much hospital parking overflow...	Accept	Section 12
2379	S601.005	Julie Strange	Mapping	Oppose	Remove high density development in areas surrounding Nelson College and Nelson Intermediate [inferred].	Nelson College and Nelson Intermediate create a large amount of congestion with kids cars. There is already a reasonable amount of subdivision in this area with many properties now subdivide to 2 and 3 residents... High rise is not appropriate.	Accept in part	Section 12
2380	S602.001	Andrew Ng	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Ditch Plan29, start fresh, ask the people what they want, and grow the city in a way that everyone likes.	Plan29 wants to do good, but it's done wrong and it's too much. The city is growing, which is cool, and we need cheaper places to live. But there's not enough proof showing where people want to live and why. Since Plan29 is a big deal, we need better proof. Also, it's so extreme that people can't get behind it and might push away those who support it. This is especially concerning because different changes have been made seemingly in secret, or without much publicity.	Reject	Section 9
2381	S603.001	SPArchitect Ltd	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Removal of Medium and High density residential zones.	Medium and High Density Residential zones will kill development in the the Inner City CBD for new Residential. This is critical for the long term viability of the city.	Accept in part	Section 12
2382	S603.004	SPArchitect Ltd	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.	Accept in part	Section 12

2383	S603.008	SPArchitect Ltd	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Protect Nelson's existing residential character [inferred].	Loss of city character - Nelson has an eclectic heritage character with is typified by covering a range of housing eras. These are in conflict with a multistorey apartment buildings at 19.5m high 1m off a boundary. This leads to a typology that would be the loss of Nelson's heritage - it isn't a single street - Richmond Ave - Elliot St - Seymour Ave it is the streetscape as a whole that is the character of the city - mid century adjacent to 1850's along side 1920's Bungalow. We have been doing infill since the city began, but always in a similar scale. It is the collective whole that is the character of the city . This plan would destroy that character needlessly. If we embraced our existing scale we can proceed with infill that enhances our city. The RMA handbrake has been the 1 dwelling / 600m2 which is less dense than existing heritage models of South Street and Elliot Street. We already have a density model in the city as a template.	Reject	Section 12
2384	S603.027	SPArchitect Ltd	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Build density review stages into the Plan Change to review the plan every 5-10 years for critical population targets as set out in this plan. Adjust the density provisions as required after these reviews.	Build in review stages - with population growth. This alternative proposal is based on the CBD being the primary population growth driver. Review every 5-10 years for critical population targets set out in this plan. Adjust as required. The proposed medium density rule could be brought in once the CBD hit a population of 2000 - to really focus development in this area first. The new general residential rules will kick start a huge amount of infill without a medium density rule in play.	Reject	Section 10
2385	S604.001	EasyDiner limited	Areas outside of the Plan Change	Support in part	Support in full, but request that all land within 1km of existing urban areas be rezoned to urban [residential/commercial].	The NPSUD requires planning decisions to be responsive to proposals that would add significant to plan enabled capacity that would enable well-functioning urban environments. Rural zoned land that is not in outstanding natural landscapes, that is not covered by the NPS for highly productive land, or in areas that are subject to natural hazards should be available for urban expansion if that land would contribute to well-functioning urban environments.	Support in part	Section 12
2386	S605.004	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Subdivision and development should relate to local topography, climate, heritage, culture, and locally distinctive materials and vegetation, balancing future growth with the values and character of the existing environment. while being future-focussed and accommodating the planned built character of the zone.	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Reject	Section 12
2387	FS64.004	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.	Accept	Section 12

2388	S605.020	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend] DO15.1.1.i [as follows]: This policy promotes a well-functioning urban environment with a compact urban form, while recognising existing character and amenity of localities. This is to conserve the recreational and visual amenity of the existing rural areas that surround the urban area of the District. It is also to promote the efficient use and development of infrastructure and land, and to provide a framework within which the true costs and benefits of new and existing infrastructure and reticulation are considered. Infill development may be appropriate in many parts of the city, and can involve new development, or redevelopment. It generally provides for greater intensity of use and development.	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Accept in part	Section 13
2389	FS64.021	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.	Accept	Section 12
2390	S605.023	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend] DO16.v Overlays [as follows]: Zones are different from overlays. Overlays are areas of the District within which particular issues arise. Chapter 3 describes how overlays are presented in the Planning Maps and outlines the relevant issues. Overlay boundaries are usually determined by the physical extent of, or constraints on, resources and therefore do not coincide with zone boundaries, which often also reflect social conditions. The Plan recognises the uses Areas/overlays that identify qualifying matters, such as Character Area, that require additional consideration of surrounding environment before the full extent of permitted built of the relevant zone is undertaken.	Refer to reasons in submission point S605.002.	Accept in part	Section 12

2391	FS64.024	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.	Accept	Section 12
2392	S605.051	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prepare a social impact assessment for PC29 [inferred].	PC29 is lacking a detailed social impact assessment validating the position that the intensification proposed will achieve the benefits claimed in relation to the social, economic, and cultural wellbeing of future generations. Council must still ensure that they achieve a well-functioning urban environment, which requires assessment of all people, inclusive of both current and future generations.	Reject	Section 13
2393	FS34.001	Jane Peterson		Support	Accept	I agree with this submitter that PC29 is lacking a detailed social impact assessment that shows the proposed intensification will achieve the benefits claimed in relation to the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of future generations.	Accept in part	Section 13
2394	FS64.052	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Accept	Section 12
2395	S605.052	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reduce the scale of PC29 while still meeting obligations of NPS-UD [inferred].	The NPS-UD does require the Council to provide at least sufficient development capacity in the short, medium and long term.4 The Council have identified a relatively small deficit of 864 houses in the long term.5 PC29 therefore forms an intensification of unjustified magnitude. We note that Tier 2 councils shall enable housing commensurate to relative demand for housing and business use in that location.6 The scale (heights and density) of development anticipated under PC29 significantly exceeds the levels of housing demand identified within the Housing and Business Capacity Assessments ('HBA'). There is significant scope for Council to reduce the scale of PC29 while still meeting their obligations within the NPS-UD.	Support in part	Section 12
2396	FS64.053	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Accept	Section 12
2397	S605.053	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Undertake finer grained assessment and community engagement as per FDS process [inferred].	Housing intensification would have been appropriately progressed through detailed discussion with the community during the Future Development Strategy 2022 ('FDS 2022'). While the FDS 2022 does identify some areas for intensification, it acknowledges that heights and locations are indicative only and provides a guide for the future. The FDS process anticipated that a finer scale assessment would be undertaken through the amendments to the zoning and rule frameworks. The anticipated finer grained assessment and community engagement was not undertaken prior to notification of PC29.	Accept in part	Section 9
2398	FS64.054	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Accept	Section 12

2399	S605.054	Hamish and Jane GrenfellHamish & Jane Grenfell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Progress relief to theprovisions identified in submission points S605.002 - S605.050 through PC29 Hearings or Environment Court appealprocesses, including consequential amendments [inferred].	The provisions identified in the [submission points S605.002 - S605.050] are opposed in their entirety. The relief provided forms an example of drafting amendments only, and alternative relief to these provisions may be progressed through PC29 Hearings or Environment Court appeal processes. Consequential amendments are also anticipated.	Reject	Section 9
2400	FS64.055	Sarah-Jane Weir		Support	Accept	I support the submission made by Hamish and Jane Grenfell in its entirety.	Accept	Section 12
2401	S606.001	David Ayre	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Support the general intention of Plan Change 29 to intensify Nelson by intensification rather than expanding at the edges.	I agree that intensification is the better of these two alternatives, and support this objective. Until now Nelson has been a relatively low density city, and we now need to create more intense housing, fit for the 21st century and beyond, and stop spending our time and energy in expensive and unnecessary travel. This gives us an excellent opportunity to build a better Nelson for the 21st century and beyond, to bring our people together in strong and vibrant communities, and play our part in adapting to a more resilient future. Two very large parts of this future are providing good opportunities for active and public transport and dealing with climate change by making major reductions in our production of greenhouse gases. Since in Nelson at the moment about 75% of our greenhouse gases come from transport, all of these issues are tied together.	Accept in part	Section 12
2402	S606.003	David Ayre	Entire Plan Change	Amend	[Undertake] another set of public discussion and consultation on how we create a good future for Nelson at the level of detailed community initiatives, either within PC29 or, if necessary, by startingagain.	The approach that Nelson City Council has taken to this plan has created a great deal of concern and resistance to change in the community, which has caused direct harm to the cultural well-being and health of many people. None of that was necessary. It has lowered trust in the Council and its planning process, which now needs to be rebuilt. The main cause of this was a misstep between the Future Development Strategy in 2022 under the previous Council and PC29 in 2023 under this Council. Many people who had made submissions to, or simply observed, the FDS in 2022 had the clear understanding that the FDS was a high level strategic process, and that when the next step of the planning process started at a more detailed level there would be another set of public discussion and consultation on how we create a good future for Nelson at the level of detailed community initiatives. Instead, PC29 left out all discussion about the nature of the Nelson we want to build in the future, and jumped directly to a very detailed RMA process that overwhelmed a great many people in the community. What they had been expecting, and wanted, was a discussion about vision. What they got was an RMA document with an immense set of rules saying what PC29 would not allow, and asking them if they wanted to change any. This was a complete disconnect, and needs correcting, either within PC29 or, if necessary, by starting again.	Reject	Section 13

2403	S606.004	David Ayre	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Clarify] Future population projections.	One of the major government framework documents controlling PC29 is the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD), which requires local authorities to plan for their expected future population over the next 30 years. In doing this, the local authorities can use population projections from Stats NZ, or, if they wish, an appropriate alternative source. Nelson chose to use data from an alternative source, whose population projections are significantly higher than Stats NZ, for both the FDS and now for PC29. The population projections used for PC29 are absolutely central to the detailed future plans for the city. Given this, they have not been subject to close examination and public discussion. They need to be. Instead they have simply been provided to the FDS and PC29 as received best estimates, without any significant discussion with the community about what they are based on. Given that our population in Aotearoa and in the world are both approaching break-even replacement in about the next 20 years, changes in our population in Nelson are based almost entirely on rates of net inwards migration to Aotearoa, and/or migration from other areas of the country. These things need to be a much more up front, visible, and transparent as part of the process, or dealing with unexpected changes will also cause harm in our community.	Reject	Section 10
2404	S606.005	David Ayre	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Plan the future of Nelson in an adaptable way by making progressive changes in different areas at different times, rather than simply rezoning very large areas of the city as medium or high density.	Future population changes are uncertain. They may be less than projected, or more than projected, for many reasons. One of the main reasons why they could be more is because the slow rate at which we are currently responding to climate change is expected to cause global warming of at least 2.7°C relative to pre-industrial temperatures by the end of the century. This is much higher than the early 1.2°C global warming we have experienced so far, and is likely to cause high inward migration pressures from people in areas where local temperatures and/or water supply become unliveable. These issues of population movement are much wider than just our community in Nelson and need long discussions with central government. For all these reasons, it is very important to plan the future of Nelson in an adaptable way, by making progressive changes in different areas at different times, rather than simply rezoning very large areas of the city as medium or high density, thereby committing a very wide scale new pattern of development when we don't know what the future holds.	Reject	Section 10
2405	S606.006	David Ayre	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Limit population growth, or start a new population centre from scratch that is designed and built for life in this century (e.g. to scale, better building design, low energy demand, active transport), and provides employment and services within its own community, rather than acting as a satellite to Nelson or other centres.	PC29 has no significant discussion of the population limits of Nelson. There needs to be. If our population grows by 2% per year, Nelson will double in about 35 years, then double again in the next 35 years (to four times our population today), and so on from there, so even changes that sound small make an immense difference. Where we are going needs discussion in the community. There are physical limits to Nelson, land, transport corridors, water supply, etc, and these need to be allowed for. Large population changes should be handled by starting a new population centre from scratch that is designed and built for life in this century (e.g. to scale, better building design, low energy demand, active transport), and provides employment and services within its own community, rather than acting as a satellite to Nelson or other centres, with all the associated travel.	Reject	Section 12
2406	S606.015	David Ayre	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Explicitly identify and allow for very significant tree cover in all future plans in all public areas, including all roads, parks, and green belts.	As we encounter global warming at much higher levels, it will be even more important than it is now to have very significant tree cover to cool the areas concerned and the wider city. This tree cover should be in all public areas, including all roads, parks, and green belts. It needs to be explicitly identified and allowed for in all future plans.	Reject	Section 11

2407	S606.016	David Ayre	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Provide good facilities for the use of solar power in new buildings and where significant changes are made to existing buildings.	New buildings and significant changes to existing buildings need to provide good facilities for the use of solar power.	Reject	Section 11
2408	S606.019	David Ayre	Infrastructure	Amend	Consider the future of major community infrastructure (e.g. Nelson Airport and Nelson Hospital) so that moving these is possible if/ when necessary [inferred].	Facilities that are central to the community should be identified for separate discussion in more detail. The most obvious single examples are Nelson Airport and Nelson Hospital, but there are others. In particular, we need to discuss where we are going to put Nelson Airport in the future. A large amount of sea level rise is now inevitable as a result of greenhouse gas emissions we have already created, and we are continuing to create more. As a result, we will either need to protect the existing Nelson Airport site strongly in the future, or we'll need to move the airport. That will have major implications for suitable land in the region, both for the airport itself, and for related land use and services. That should be considered in detail now, so that move is possible if/when necessary.	Reject	Section 11
2409	S606.021	David Ayre	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Identify clear minimum intensification levels for new developments [inferred].	All new development, wherever it is, should be created at appropriate intensification levels from the beginning, identified by a clear urban plan for new developments, rather than being created as low density development and then in a few decades trying to rework it at higher densities.	Reject	Section 13
2410	S607.001	Belinda Fletcher	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject] the proposed new residential zones and retain the existing residential classifications.	New Zones especially HDRS is not suitable or necessary. To allow HDRZ in a residential zone will have detrimental effect on those areas in that: It will cause those areas particularly where there are older homes to lose their specific street character and landscape causing breakup of those areas by bulk buildings in those areas. The character and landscape need to be preserved in those areas. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
2411	S607.003	Belinda Fletcher	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Amend Plan Change 29 to allow graduated increased height in the inner city - centre zone. Generally, this graduated approach to be followed in all CBD /town areas merging with residential areas. Start with medium density at the inner-city fringe and increase to no more than 8 storeys inner city-centre.	Blanket height levels in the fringe and inner-city centre are unattractive and do not create a vibrant liveable city. The highest parts of the Rutherford hotel and clock tower detracts from the city-scape and do not integrate into the surrounding city-scape and are eyesores. A more subtle and graduated approach to building/ development is needed. Random development of levels of buildings and building closer into the streets will not provide a more vibrant or safer city.	Accept in part	Section 12
2412	S607.007	Belinda Fletcher	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Make specific provision for greater green areas and landscaping with no reliance on existing green spaces or landscaping.	The inner city and centre need to ensure increased green spaces and landscaping of these areas with new development. There should not be reliance on existing green areas and landscaping. The city needs more of these areas not less or defused by more building to green space proportion.	Reject	Section 11

2413	S608.005	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Support] 3 Dwellings per Title as of right on all residential sections, but with no development contributions payable where the 3 waters infrastructure load is not significantly changed.	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).	Reject	Section 11
2414	FS5.029	Warwick Rogers		Oppose	Reject	A blanket rule allowing 3 dwellings per section is just crazy. Many places cannot cater to such density, and we will end up with slum shanty towns.	Reject	Section 12
2415	FS38.019	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support in part are: [Support] 3 Dwellings per Title as of right on all residential sections, but with no development contributions payable where the 3 waters Infrastructure load is not significantly changed. The 3 dwellings rule is a key one for opening opportunities for affordable housing. I believe policies already exist for discounts in similar situations.	Accept in part	Section 9
2416	S608.013	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Residential Zones	Amend	[Require or provide] parks, reserves or public open space in the residential zones, spaced no further apart than 1/2km, or so that no one has to go further than 250m to get to an open space.	Part of higher density living is the provision of parks, reserves or open space close by every house. If they are spaced no further apart than 1/2km, then no one has to go further than 250m to get to one. Even if these are just a regular sized suburban section where the house is moved away and it is planted up with large and small trees, quite a bit of grass, perhaps some play equipment for children a seat to rest on and ideally toilets as well - for particular children and the elderly who may get caught short. We note that the often voiced opinion that children need a 1/4 acre to kick a ball and run around on is wrong in that often there were windows to be smashed and flower beds to be trampled on that severely curtailed this from being a real thing. We think have close by reserves where this can really happen is a better option.	Accept in part	Section 12

2417	S608.017	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Infrastructure	Amend	Consider low water use fittings, greywater reuse and stormwater detention tanks when calculating infrastructure capacity adn devlopment contributions [inferred].	The council can have a fair handle on what the loads from the 3 waters would be from their existing monitoring of water supply to houses. If the water supply to an intensified development is no more than the previous one house (or at least an average single house) then as discussed above, why should a DC be payable? - after all water coming into the property as potable water is directly correlated to volume out in sewerage that the pipes have to take. And there are numerous things that can be done with new low water use fittings that mean you can actually service more people with no more water supply or sewage volume (eg you can get 3 & 4.5 litre dual flush toilets that are a replacement to the old 12 litre ones these older houses had, you can get aerating taps that mean you use less water for hand washing and rinsing dishes, you can get front loading washing machines that use perhaps half the water a top loader does). And all this is assuming no grey water is re-used in toilets and no rainwater collected! With stormwater pipe work - the council could insist on stormwater detention tanks to buffer stormwater loads so that any increase in roof area resulted in no increase in stormwater load. And there are a variety of permeable paving solutions now available that result in no additional stormwater load over what open ground would have had.	Reject	Section 11
2418	S608.025	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the intent of the plan change, but seek a range of significant changes as outlined in the submission.	Public Transport Functions Better with a compact urban form. A sprawling low density settlement pattern such as we have been following since the 1950s can only very expensively be provided with a public transport service and then it will not be very frequent and so will not be more attractive than car driving. But with more dense settlements buses become more viable. This has a snowballing effect: because more people use the buses the service can be expanded and made more frequent, which makes them more attractive for more people... The national target in the Emissions Reduction Plan is a reduction in light vehicle km travelled by 41%: a compact urban form is an essential part of this reduction... Active transport is more viable with a compact urban form as distances to where people need to get to are shorter... Our region has the highest car ownership... We think one of the significant reasons for this is that Nelson City has not allowed intensification. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 9
2419	S608.026	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support for plan change intent to prioritise intensification within existing urban area [inferred].	Carbon Cost of Infrastructure km is Less: The Infrastructure requirements are significantly less for a compact city compared to a sprawling one and this comes at a carbon cost per km of roads, footpaths, pipelines for the 3 waters, km of fibre optic and electricity cables as well as trenching km all come at an increasing carbon cost the more sprawling our settlement patterns are... Maintenance to roads, footpaths, pipelines for the 3 waters, are all directly related to distance. Compact cites have fewer km of this infrastructure to maintain, meaning less burden on ratepayers... The inefficiency due to this sprawl is one of the key reasons settlements throughout New Zealand are struggling to maintain their infrastructure at an acceptable level. [[Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12

2420	S608.027	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support for spatial pattern of residential intensification surrounding the inner city zones, with no associated protections for existing views and existing character areas [inferred],	We note the present plan says nothing about having to build houses in keeping with your neighbours and nothing about protecting views. We think that Californian bungalows although they have their charm in summer are a maintenance nightmare, are rarely an appropriate plan for the way we live now, are literally impossible to insulate or draft- proof well and so are energy hogs as well as cold, damp, unhealthy environments for people to live in. While accepting a few heritage areas essentially set in stone and unable to be changed, this is completely wrong for the rest of the city [sic] . We don't think maintenance of neighbours views is a good enough reason for blocking increases in density. If there was a requirement to show how you are not significantly affecting neighbours views, this could be massively misused to block density increases just as "heritage" is being used as a density-increase block... We would push back hard on CBD intensification as the only necessary intensification... We need that townhouse "donut" ring of middle density that is missing around the CBD. This was what we were doing before planning rules came in that insisted on low density here at the bottom of Shelbourne St. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
2421	S609.001	Adam Stait	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose/decline Plan Change 29.	Do not agree with so many areas being able to build 3 or 4 stories high without consent, this will have a big impact on sunshine hours, privacy and safety, I also do not think that we have the infrastructure on roads to accommodate such a large growth in the Nelson population, and worried how this will impact the environment as well. We as a community chose to live in Nelson for the laid back sunny safe lifestyle and I think plan 29s changes will have a major negative impact in this region in the future and will go down in history as one of the worst decisions the council has made if it goes ahead.	Reject	Section 12
2422	S610.001	Sarah Little	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Remove] the high density residential zone from Plan Change 29. If it can't be removed, allow an HDZ in the Nelson CBD area alone.	They are not mandated by the government plan. While Nelson needs to accomodate growth this can be either achieved under current zoning anyway (as seen by tahunanui flats for example) or by lower zones. The character of Nelson would be forever changed and if I wanted to see or live in or by high rise buildings I would move to one of the larger cities (Auckland, Christchurch, Wellington etc). It also seems pointless to have the HRZ if it would in practice need a resource consent anyway if it had more than 3 units.	Accept in part	Section 12
2423	S610.007	Sarah Little	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Remove intensification 'as of right' provisions. A neighbourhood by neighbourhood approach to the planning should be done.	The current Plan rules do not prevent sufficient development from happening, so there is no need to change the zones. This approach would ensure that each area could keep an intensification that suited the area.	Reject	Section 13
2424	S610.009	Sarah Little	Residential Zones	Neutral	[Provide] more greenspaces to any areas where the zoning is changed.	The planet needs more trees.	Reject	Section 11
2425	S611.001	James Genever	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Include a formal design step in the city planning and resource consent process, overseen by the NCC as custodian, to better optimize the nature of intensification for the long-term benefit of the community. A design competition(s) could be included as part of this for key changes like a pedestrianized Trafalgar Street.	Very attractive planned streetscapes for Nelson inner city, with consultation, can be instrumental in bringing increased foot traffic, economic activity and a positive ambience back to Nelson. The plan change should be designed to accentuate the outstanding natural setting we have for our city. I support Timo Neubauer's view (published Oct 23 in Stuff/Nelson Mail) concerning neighborhood plans and a design for each urban block, building on a shared vision for those affected. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2426	S612.001	Ayumi Stait	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose Plan Change 29.	Where I live in Nelson is safe, great community and long day sunshine in a day. If there are 3 / 4 stories high residential area develop without a consent, I am very concern that our community would lose safety.	Reject	Section 9

2427	S613.001	Jason McCormick	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject] the proposed new residential zones and retain the existing residential classifications.	New Zones especially HDRS is not suitable or necessary. To allow HDRZ in a residential zone will have detrimental effect on those areas in that: It will cause those areas particularly where there are older homes to lose their specific street character and landscape causing breakup of those areas by bulk buildings in those areas. The character and landscape need to be preserved in those areas. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
2428	S613.003	Jason McCormick	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Amend Plan Change 29 to allow graduated increased height in the inner city - centre zone. Generally, this graduated approach to be followed in all CBD /town areas merging with residential areas. Start with medium density at the inner-city fringe and increase to no more than 8 storeys inner city-centre.	Blanket height levels in the fringe and inner-city centre are unattractive and do not create a vibrant liveable city. The highest parts of the Rutherford hotel and clock tower detracts from the city-scape and do not integrate into the surrounding city-scape and are eyesores. A more subtle and graduated approach to building/ development is needed. Random development of levels of buildings and building closer into the streets will not provide a more vibrant or safer city.	Accept in part	Section 12
2429	S613.007	Jason McCormick	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Make specific provision for greater green areas and landscaping with no reliance on existing green spaces or landscaping.	The inner city and centre need to ensure increased green spaces and landscaping of these areas with new development. There should not be reliance on existing green areas and landscaping. The city needs more of these areas not less or defused by more building to green space proportion.	Reject	Section 11
2430	S614.001	Redbox Architects 2017 Ltd	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the intent of the proposed Plan Change 29 (PC29) to intensify housing supply in and around our primary urban areas... with the prioritisation of intensification over new greenfield development further from essential public services and infrastructure.	We strongly support the change in approach to growth and development which has been proposed by this plan change with the prioritisation of intensification over new greenfield development further from essential public services and infrastructure. We hope that Council can maintain its resolve to bring about positive change in our region and that the possible negative submissions do not delay or prevent the implementation of this change which will assist in the ability for Nelson to become a vibrant connected and environmentally responsible city. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Support in part	Section 9
2431	S614.002	Redbox Architects 2017 Ltd	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support the introduction of medium density residential zone.	Refer to reasons in submission point S614.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2432	S614.003	Redbox Architects 2017 Ltd	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support the introduction of the high density residential zone.	Refer to reasons in submission point S614.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2433	S614.011	Redbox Architects 2017 Ltd	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Consider provisions related to energy use or harvesting, water management and waste disposal and ventilation.	The plan change makes little reference or requirements around environmental considerations. The change considers the effect of environmental noise specifically but makes no comment on energy use or harvesting, water management, or waste disposal. The requirement for mechanically controlled ventilation over natural ventilation as a viable option in our climate is also not considered.	Reject	Section 11
2434	S615.003	Margot Miller	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose changes to resource consent [particularly relating to] sunlight and privacy.	Our home has sunlight and privacy. We want this to continue. We think the town needs a new thoughtful plan.	Reject	Section 12

2435	S616.001	Loretta Hogg	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	PC29 should be withdrawn and good community engagement and neighbourhood planning completed. If substantial changes occur to as a result of PC29 submissions/ hearing/ decision process then PC29 should be withdrawn and re drafted.	I am strongly opposed to all of the proposed policies and rules in PC 29. Well considered planning is necessary to be put in place before anything starts, to move us forward into a vibrant, welcoming, cohesive, beautiful city. The local community-led based meetings showed an enormous amount of enthusiasm to bring people together, to engage community, to explain and help break down what Plan Change 29 is about. To discuss and come up with options and encourage community to make this work, and have input in the development of a beautiful well thought out city, before we hand it over to 'developers'. There was great insight and intelligence shown, collective commitment to well-considered ideas, great forward thinking, and a real energy to support working in harmony together with other individual citizens An intelligent understanding and knowledge of what is happening in other towns, cities and countries, who already have or are working on intensive residential housing development, and community planning ideas that could be used in Nelson. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2436	S616.002	Loretta Hogg	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	If PC29 is retained the policies and rules must reflect the interim and short term (10 year) position and demand/capacity analysis rather than 30 year long term time frame.	Refer to reasons in submission point S616.001.	Reject	Section 10
2437	S616.003	Loretta Hogg	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reduce the High Density Residential Zone (HDZ). Apply HDZ policies and rules to allow up to six-storey residential building developments only to the inner city and inner city fringe zones.	I also support - more intensive affordable residential housing development in Nelson City, and appropriate policies and rules are necessary to achieve this. The Actual City Centre is surely the obvious first choice for more intensive residential development. Upgrade what is already there. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
2438	S616.004	Loretta Hogg	Residential Zones	Oppose	Apply the General Residential Zone (GRZ) policies and rules beyond the Inner City and Inner-City Fringe.	Refer to reasons in submission point S616.003.	Accept in part	Section 12
2439	S616.008	Loretta Hogg	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Undertake neighbourhood planning as referred to in the FDS prior to PC29 becoming operative.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2440	S617.001	Sarah Holman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw the intensification provisions of proposed Plan Change 29.	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. {Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Awaiting recommendation	Section 9
2441	FS40.001	Belinda Reburn		Support	Accept	I support this submission in full.	Accept	Section 9

2442	FS61.094	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	Accept in part	Section 9
2443	FS72.098	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	Accept in part	Section 9

2444	FS60.090	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	Accept in part	Section 9
2445	S617.002	Sarah Holman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Undertake a new precautionary, staged approach to planning a level of intensification as signalled in the FDS evaluation reviews.	This is not sustainable, precautionary planning. Allowing such high levels of intensification without the need for a resource consent application is not a precautionary approach to change. The FDS refers to 'quality intensification within existing neighbourhoods'. This is very unlikely to occur when so few restrictions are proposed.	Reject	Section 10
2446	FS61.095	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	Accept in part	Section 9

2447	FS72.099	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	Accept in part	Section 9
2448	FS60.091	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	Accept in part	Section 9
2449	S617.003	Sarah Holman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Develop new intensification plans based on:	Inadequate information to develop Plan Change The population projections used to set the level of housing demand are flawed. No overall design guide has been developed for Nelson. No Spatial neighbourhood plans have been developed in consultation with the community. No specific areas ripe for redevelopment have been identified. No social impact study has been undertaken to support the proposal. {Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

2450	FS61.096	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	Accept in part	Section 9
2451	FS72.100	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	Accept in part	Section 9

2452	FS72.115	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	Accept in part	Section 9
2453	FS60.092	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	Accept in part	Section 9
2454	S617.004	Sarah Holman	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the proposed HDZ and MDZ from all land currently zoned residential and reinstate amenity controls in NRMP including daylight and setbacks.	Provisions for intensification are based on quantitative not qualitative measures. PPC29 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. This level of proposed intensification is not mandatory under NPS Urban Growth; Nelson is Tier 2 not Tier 1. {Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12

2455	FS61.097	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	Accept in part	Section 9
2456	FS72.101	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	Accept in part	Section 9

2457	FS60.123	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	Accept in part	Section 9
2458	S617.005	Sarah Holman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Restrict] medium density zoning to the Inner City and Inner City Fringe Zones.	The Inner City Zone (PPC29) has a lot of vacant space with concerns about its economic viability. Currently 44% of the Inner City Centre zone is used for car parking (see Nelsust submission) which could be consolidated in a more land efficient way. Increased residential activity is likely to activate more demand for retail and hospitality services. High density zoning is not required in residential zones when this space is available.	Accept in part	Section 12
2459	FS61.098	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	Accept in part	Section 9

2460	FS72.102	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	Accept in part	Section 9
2461	FS60.093	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	Accept in part	Section 9
2462	S617.006	Sarah Holman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Plan for regular reviews of the FDS to incrementally provide for intensification if demand is established.	The Future Development Strategy refers to being able to be responsive to population projection changes, whether up or down. The cautious approach would be to increase intensification relative to medium projections not high growth and to start in the centre of the city.	Reject	Section 12

2463	FS61.099	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	Accept in part	Section 9
2464	FS72.103	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	Accept in part	Section 9

2465	FS60.094	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	Accept in part	Section 9
2466	S617.008	Sarah Holman	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request that 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.	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.	Accept in part	Section 12
2467	FS61.101	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	Accept in part	Section 9

2468	FS72.105	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	Accept in part	Section 9
2469	FS60.096	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	Accept in part	Section 9
2470	S617.012	Sarah Holman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Retain an Urban Design Panel and make use of it mandatory for discretionaryconsent applications.	It is vital that the Urban Design Panel is retained and utilised.	Accept	Section 13

2471	FS61.105	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	Accept in part	Section 9
2472	FS72.109	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	Accept in part	Section 9

2473	FS60.100	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	Accept in part	Section 9
2474	S617.029	Sarah Holman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Replace the 2 councillors on the hearing panel with independent commissioners due to perceived conflicts of interest.	The Hearing Panel makeup needs to be reviewed due to perceived conflicts of interest.	Reject	Section 13
2475	FS61.124	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	Accept in part	Section 9

2476	FS72.127	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	Accept in part	Section 9
2477	FS60.117	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	Accept in part	Section 9

2478	S619.001	Charles Douglas	Mapping	Oppose	[Replace the] High Density Residential Zone on Tahunanui Hills with Medium Density, if not general residential.	Firstly, I understand that in order for Nelson to grow - more accomodation is required to house people. This includes a mix of different housing, in different areas at different price points. That being said, it seems a little outrageous that a small, seemingly random blob of the Tahunanui Hills has been zoned for High Density. The area in question is subject to a general slip zone. The roads are local roads... all of them! Tosswill Road and Tamaki Street are local roads and aren't designed to take a lot of traffic. The nearby zone across the road From Tosswill road have been zoned as Medium... however with High Density across the road, why anyone would actually want to develop their property given the risk of being built out. Few amenities in this area. Tahunanui Hills doesn't have lots of things readily available to it. Rates would need to be adjusted, massively. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
2479	FS61.078	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Firstly, I understand that in order for Nelson to grow - more accomodation is required to house people. This includes a mix of different housing, in different areas at different price points. That being said, it seems a little outrageous that a small, seemingly random blob of the Tahunanui Hills has been zoned for High Density. The area in question is subject to a general slip zone. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Reinforces need for local community plans and engagement.	Accept	Section 12
2480	FS72.082	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Firstly, I understand that in order for Nelson to grow - more accomodation is required to house people. This includes a mix of different housing, in different areas at different price points. That being said, it seems a little outrageous that a small, seemingly random blob of the Tahunanui Hills has been zoned for High Density. The area in question is subject to a general slip zone. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Reinforces need for local community plans and engagement.	Accept in part	Section 12
2481	FS60.074	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- Firstly, I understand that in order for Nelson to grow - more accomodation is required to house people. This includes a mix of different housing, in different areas at different price points. That being said, it seems a little outrageous that a small, seemingly random blob of the Tahunanui Hills has been zoned for High Density. The area in question is subject to a general slip zone. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Reinforces need for local community plans and engagement.	Accept	Section 12
2482	S619.003	Charles Douglas	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Encourage moderate intensification by [applying] the high density residential zone sparingly.	Does Nelson really need apartments up to 18m high? Serious question but if building 3 story units/townhouses etc.. I can imagine most people would prefer that sort of living in a "small city" to apartments.	Accept in part	Section 12

2483	S620.001	Roger Sowman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Pause] Plan Change 29 until more homework is done on the alternatives and more public consultation is sought.	In its present form I reject Plan Change 29 entirely, but in particular I am vehemently opposed to the zoning of established residential areas to provide for both medium and high density Housing. I do not believe NCC and city planners have given adequate attention to better utilisation of under or undeveloped land in the city centre and city fringe. Before zoning exiting residential areas for high density housing, city centre and city fringe need to be utilised. Because new apartment buildings do not have to provide parking I assume council don't want citizens to own cars but prefer them to move about by walking, cycling or public transport. This being the case apartment housing is best suited to the city centre or fringe so why would council want to ruin residential communities by allowing high and medium density development in suburbia? Please leave our beautiful residential areas alone while clearly there are more suitable areas in the city centre and fringe.	Reject	Section 9
2484	S620.005	Roger Sowman	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 S620.002.	Accept in part	Section 12
2485	S620.007	Roger Sowman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S620.002 and S620.005 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2486	S620.010	Roger Sowman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S620.008 and S620.009 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
2487	S622.002	Jonathan McCallum	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Progress the drafting of comprehensive neighbourhood plans.	I support intensification, not greenfields expansion, for the revitalisation of our city center, to reduce transport emissions and to enable affordable housing. I generally support the reasoning given by NelsonTasman2050 in their submission.	Accept in part	Section 13
2488	S623.001	Alistair Kwan	Entire Plan Change	Support	Agree with increasing residential density close to the commercial centres of Nelson and Stoke.	Not stated.	Accept in part	Section 12
2489	S623.002	Alistair Kwan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Provide the motivations that explain the proposal, grounded in a comprehensive evaluation of desired outcomes, and driven by a comprehensive evaluation of Nelson's constraints and problems.	The proposed change does not recognise much of the reasoning that could motivate increased residential density. There are many, including better economic function (notably for downtown retail), better functioning and provision of public transportation, improved public safety, reduced congestion, better access to rural space because it will remain close to residents rather than being pushed out by sprawl. Saying that people need homes it's true. Saying only that people need homes is lying by omission, guarantees a poor decision-making process, and cannot be expected to lead us to optimal outcomes.	Reject	Section 9
2490	S623.003	Alistair Kwan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Write a new proposal that speaks explicitly to good urban planning. This must include basics such as modelling [and] 1. circulation, transport, temperature, humidity, wind, water flows, noise levels. 2. urban ecosystem services. to identify both 1. where increased populations densities will achieve the best outcomes. 2. where taller, closer building forms will achieve the best outcomes.	This proposed change is very difficult to respond to because it has been presented without the background research needed to understand what it is for and what it is meant to achieve. Specifically, it lacks rationale for any specific changes, and it lacks a clear strategic direction or purpose. It hence does not read as a plan change proposal, but merely as a new managerial ruleset that appears to be uninformed by even introductory-level urban planning concepts, principles and methods. Not having done this writing work, plus the general absence of rationale and vision, gives the impression that the proposal was written in bad faith. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9

2491	S623.004	Alistair Kwan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Contextualise the project within a vision for Nelson's long-term future - a design strategy that we need our Councillors to strive towards, even if they have not studied urban planning.	Refer to reasons in submission point S623.003.	Accept in part	Section 13
2492	S623.005	Alistair Kwan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Employ a technical writer and editor for the project.	Refer to reasons in submission point S623.003.	Reject	Section 9
2493	S623.006	Alistair Kwan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Enable participation from people without enough time, enough money, enough safety, enough cultural capital.	Refer to reasons in submission point S623.003.	Reject	Section 13
2494	S623.007	Alistair Kwan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include some explicit evaluation of urban conditions justify the plan change, and also as a criterion for urban development. Read Gomez-Baggethun & al., "Urban ecosystem services" in Elmqvist & al. edd. Urbanization, biodiversity and Ecosystem Services: Challenges and Opportunities (Springer, 2013, pp. 175-221) and Meurk & al., "Ecosystem services in New Zealand cities: in Dymond, ed. Ecosystem services in New Zealand - conditions and trends (Manaaki Whenua Press, Lincoln, New Zealand).	The options include measuring urban ecosystems, using e.g. landsenses ecology. Landsenses ecology had been developing for nearly a decade, as a more multidisciplinary approach to urban ecosystem services. Landsenses ecology integrates the human and natural worlds to examine the realities of occupants' everyday experience such as our access to food and work and shelter, our safety and security, our peaceful enjoyment of a space, our being welcome in a space, our being able to enter and to leave a space at will. Engaging landsenses ecology will provide natural opportunity to speak to ao Māori considerations of the urban form, its future, and community wellbeing. Any substantial change to a site should require justification by showing that urban ecosystem service measures are improved in at least some categories, and not worsened in any categories.	Reject	Section 13
2495	S623.008	Alistair Kwan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Provide maps showing the current state of ecosystem services. These are needed to identify and prioritise where bigger changes should happen, and what kinds of changes - if any - should happen, everywhere.	These are needed to identify and prioritise where bigger changes should happen, and what kinds of changes - if any - should happen, everywhere. Refer also to the reasons in S623.007.	Reject	Section 10
2496	S623.009	Alistair Kwan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Require that applications for character-changing development include a demonstration - perhaps using landlenses ecology, or urban ecosystem services more generally - that quality of life will improve, or at least not decline, both close to the site (e.g. within 20 metres), and also in some broader neighbourhood area (e.g. within 100 street-metres) of the site.	Refer to reasons in submission point S623.007.	Reject	Section 11
2497	S623.012	Alistair Kwan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Provide for positive interaction: not merely setting aside space such as an occasional park, but by requiring spatial design of environmental cues to increase social connectivity and communal thriving.	Much is said about the need to accommodate individuals and families. More must be said about the need to build communities. The problem context here is a city, not a warehouse: we do not put up apartments simply to store people in. Those people have lives. They need to come and go, they need to connect with others both through their windows and over their property boundaries, and also when they leave and return to their properties. Others need to be able to connect with them to form neighbourhood communities.	Accept in part	Section 13
2498	S623.019	Alistair Kwan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Increase the provisions for water absorption by adding e.g. green roofs, infiltration ponds, permeable pavement, green walls, etc.	The reduced requirement for permeable surface is understandable but, given alone, it comes across as half-baked (if not merely fabricated).	Reject	Section 13

2499	S623.020	Alistair Kwan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Provide models that show the effects of building densification and require developers to show such models to demonstrate that their proposed buildings will cause no substantial harm.	The proposed plans say nothing at all about how taller, closeer buildings will affect temperatures, airflow, and reflected light and heat. Cities are already designed to admit cooling and refreshing breezes, to provide shade. Models (e.g. Implemented in ENVI-met software) are often a bit crude - mainly due to the computational costs of fine detail - but they at least give sufficient reliable ballpark indications to be widely used. There is nothing new here. It is hence hard to think of any good reasons why the modelling was not included in the proposal. In addition, we have some remarkably dumb disasters such as the 'creative' architects who build concave mirrors into a London skyscraper, focusing the reflected sunlight tightly onto the road below - causing great discomfort to pedestrians and damaging the paint on parked cars. Such mirrors also reflect noise and the same way. The mathematics to handle this has been available for approximately two thousand years (consider e.g. Apollonius's works); there is, again, nothing new.	Reject	Section 13
2500	S623.021	Alistair Kwan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Encourage green roofs, green walls.	Please consider Condominio 25 Verde, a five-storey apartment block on via Gabriele Chiabrera, Torino. It has been the essence 2012, a very short walk from the Borgo Medievale. It contains over 60 apartments, interspersed and interpenetrated by living greenery. If this is possible to remediate a dying industrial hole in Italy, we should surely be able to achieve at least half of that in a building here!	Reject	Section 13
2501	S623.023	Alistair Kwan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prescribe pavement structures that will stand up to the new climate conditions.	Refer to reasons in submission point S623.022.	Reject	Section 13
2502	S623.026	Alistair Kwan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Plant more trees, and work towards substantial shade coverage, along streets and in car parks. Start with reasonably large trees, not tiny saplings. Let the trees grow large; large is important.	Tree coverage will be lost through increases in building coverage, with consequences for water management, temperature, and greenness (say urban ecosystem services above), and also for the wildlife connectivity between the coast, the Brook Waimarama Sanctuary, and other nearby ecosystem areas. There is extensive recent research on how cities benefit and many, many ways from urban forest coverage.	Reject	Section 13
2503	S623.027	Alistair Kwan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Include more open space, and more green space, throughout the city - pockets need to be everywhere, serving as both community foci and as relief for residents.	Note that, if implemented as public courtyards, these spaces might also be considered reason to construct buildings closer to the site boundary. They would need to be protected as welcoming public space, however - not configured as pseudo-foyers for the buildings adjacent to them (for a model of a public space whose design gave control to private interest, consider City Square in Melbourne.	Reject	Section 13
2504	S623.028	Alistair Kwan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Focus densification on the inner city: it should spike centrally, or very nearly centrally.	Downtown Nelson does not have an area like the Italian centri storici that requires total preservation as-is, nor a bombed-out circle of World War II horror into to which we can pile a hundred cheap-and=ugly (but quick-to-build) apartment blocks; we can more appropriately add residential structures to the inner city while improving the downtown environment and adding population to support retail and hospitality. Doing so does not need to generate conflict with nightclubs. Implementing equal densification further out would naturally increase transportation needs, reducing overall urban efficiency and putting more spending into fuel than into the goods and services that our local economy might otherwise thrive on. An intermediate ring of medium-density, two- or three-storey townhouses (consider London terrace houses with small but substantial backyards) could be invaluable and achieving residential capacity without giving the city a delta-pulse profile, and cultivating its natural merge with adjacent green space. These points have already been made in the 2008 Nelson Urban Growth Strategy.	Accept in part	Section 12

2505	S625.001	Resilienz Ltd Lindsay Wood	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Support the concept of substantial intensification of existing urban areas.	We are broadly very supportive of the concept of substantial intensification of existing urban areas as part of an integrated suite of strategies to address all the critical and escalating social and environmental issues we are confronting in the region and beyond. We acknowledge the enormous amount of work invested in developing Plan Change 29 (PC29) and the related consultation documents, and recognise that aspects are likely to be contentious. We do, however, highlight that this is an era that demands very different ways of doing things almost across the board, in terms of reviewing, changing and moderating our existing activities, and bringing serious innovation to both traditional and emerging ones. As a result we applaud PC29 as being a significant and courageous step into "different ways of doing things". Having said that, and while we see it as a promising start, we consider PC29 is still a very long way short of an acceptable finish, and has various fundamental flaws. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
2506	S625.002	Resilienz Ltd Lindsay Wood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Review the entire Plan Change 29 capturing all of the issues that have been inadequately addressed [identified in submission points S625.003 - S625.014] and integrating them into a cohesive plan.	For the strategic reasons outlined in items 1,2, and 3 [of the original submission] we object to Plan Change 29 in its entirety. Our objection would be addressed by a deeply considered strategic review of the entire plan change, capturing all of the issues that have been inadequately addressed and integrating .them into a cohesive plan. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
2507	S625.003	Resilienz Ltd Lindsay Wood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Undertake] a substantial and wide-ranging public engagement process such as the participatory democracy processes that the June 2023 review of local government encouraged councils to trial.	We are of the view that the development and consultation process of PC 29 has been seriously wanting, with regard to: - The large scale of the plan change and the complexity of the issues it seeks to address - The overclaimed levels of parity with the region's Future Development Strategy. - The (subsequently largely rectified) paucity of public engagement which, none the less, set a mistrustful and adversarial tone to the consultation. - Strategic shortcomings in the S32 report that impede proper public appreciation of the PC29 proposal. - The relative inaccessibility of key documents (e.g. through their online portal and PDF formats, even with contents pages which offer no means of locating the often-referenced "Part 2" and "Part 3" sources of information, and no hyperlinks to clauses). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

2508	S625.004	Resilienz Ltd Lindsay Wood	Natural Hazards/Climate Change	Oppose in part	Revise the Plan Change and Section 32 evaluation report to address the Resource Management Act's central concept of "sustainable management" identified in Section 5, clause (2), particularly subclauses (b) safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and (c) avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment. in relation to climate change and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions [inferred].	Clause 5 (1) of the RMA describes the Act's purpose as to "promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources." The immediately-following definition of "sustainable management" identifies three key objectives, of which 5 (2) (b) is "safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems." One of the greatest threats, if not the greatest threat, to the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems is climate change, and major causes of climate change are the emission of greenhouse gases from the burning of fossil fuels (especially, in New Zealand, from road transport), and from the construction of buildings and physical infrastructure. The S.32 report provides no reliable basis for evaluating the impact of PC29 in these regards. While the report makes numerous references to notional ways that PC29 will "support" the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. pp 29 and 33) there is no analysis or quantitative evidence whatsoever put forward to validate such claims... For example, emissions associated with buildings are generally considered to represent around 15- 20% of New Zealand's GHG emissions profile. However, the construction systems associated with high rise buildings are likely to be significantly more carbon-intensive than stand-alone timber-framed dwellings... Similarly, while intensification would be expected to reduce travel emissions for various reasons (e.g. through lower vehicle kilometers travelled and greater viability of active and public transport) there is no evidence to indicate whether or on what scale that might happen... [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2509	S625.005	Resilienz Ltd Lindsay Wood	Infrastructure	Amend	Consider renewable energy [inferred].	We find it seriously remiss (as with the FDS) that PC29 deliberately chooses not to consider renewable energy (top of p.25 of the Section 32 evaluation report) when the RMA specifically states that it should. Energy drives every economy, renewable energy must be the primary driver of our future economy, and needs to be a key part of our future planning. The implications of this omission are intensified by the failure of PC29 to consider the impacts of an Alpine Fault earthquake (e.g. "AF8") and its potential to disable the national electricity grid for an extended period... Given that such an event will put our national grid electricity security at serious risk, the failure to consider renewable electricity becomes an even graver omission, and even more so with the potential geometry of structures associated with the proposed intensification, which may well compromise the viability of some rooftop generated solar power. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2510	S625.008	Resilienz Ltd Lindsay Wood	Natural Hazards/Climate Change	Amend	Consider decarbonisation of building stock, including embodied and operational carbon in both existing and proposed buildings,	PC29 has almost nothing to say about the decarbonization challenges of our region or of the enormous carbon footprint of our building stock -- embodied and operational carbon, in both existing and proposed buildings -- when in fact we are almost bereft of ideas how to build such intensification at remotely close to aligning with our Zero Carbon Act. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2511	S625.009	Resilienz Ltd Lindsay Wood	Natural Hazards/Climate Change	Amend	[Encourage] maximizing the use of timber in lieu of concrete and steel in the construction of buildings.	There are numerous and considerable advantages to maximizing the use of timber in lieu of concrete or steel in the construction of buildings. These include use of renewable and local resources, greatly reduced carbon footprints, generally speedier and less disruptive construction, greater potential for subsequent relocation or reuse of entire buildings or their components, and lower impact on the global resource depletion crisis. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

2512	S625.014	Resilienz Ltd Lindsay Wood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Oppose the 6 storey maximum building height in the Inner City Zones [inferred].	We are opposed to the concept of a 6m [sic, 6 storeys inferred] height as of right even within the central business district. We consider buildings of such heights come with considerably more downsides than upsides for provincial towns, and that there are other ways of achieving their perceived benefits Downsides include: Increased overshadowing Dominance of important natural features of trees. Loss of human scale with regard to prevailing street widths etc. Greater wind funneling and microclimate issues. Necessity to use lifts in buildings. Greater obstruction of viewshafts. Possible additional burden on fire and emergency services and equipment requirements. The primary upside is greater plot ratio, plus marginal increase in efficiency of urban servicing. There is also a theoretical advantage of more rapid intensification if one lot proceeds notably ahead of its neighours. Refer to reasons in submission points S625.009 and S625.010 and the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 12
2513	S626.001	Raine Estate Oaklands Ltd	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Support in part Plan Change 29 to the extent that in principle, [the Plan Change supports] the direction set out in the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy [by providing] for residential and commercial growth in the Nelson region, specifically in and around Stoke.	Raine Estate Oaklands Limited are the landowners of the Oaklands Farm, situated behind Saxton Field in Stoke. Under the Nelson Resource Management Plan the farm is currently zoned Rural. Through the FDS process parts of the Oaklands Farm were identified as Growth areas - N-11 Saxton and N-115 Saxton Extension. While the Oaklands Farm property falls outside the scope of Plan Change 29, consideration of the Plan Change is relevant to Raine Estate Oaklands Limited in the context of realising the Saxton growth areas identified in the FDS. Raine Estate Oaklands Limited have completed a scoping and feasibility exercise to initiate the implementation and rezoning of these growth areas, with a Development Vision document created to capture the findings of this exercise. As a summary, a total of 60ha of development potential has been identified, with integrated ecology and open space areas, mobile connectivity and provision for a community hub. Residential living is envisaged to include terraced homes, standalone dwellings, and retirement living. Commercial areas are proposed to encompass a medical hub, food and beverage, retail spaces, farmers market and local business spaces. This submission therefore specifically relates to the amendments proposed for the Residential and Suburban Commercial zones. Raine Estate Oaklands Limited supports, in part, Plan Change 29 to the extent that: a. in principle, it provides for residential and commercial growth in the Nelson region, specifically in and around Stoke; and b. it supports the direction set out in the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12

2514	S627.001	Philip Guy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Broaden the scope of the plan for the future development of Nelson.	In general we support the intent of the proposed plan change as we recognise that Nelson is a growing city and that some intensification is required in order to cater for a growing population which would provide more varied housing options and allow people to live closer to where they work. This also gives opportunity to regenerate the town centre with more people able to socialise within the urban area and support the local retailers. However we believe that the plan as it stands is not suitable to deliver the promised gains because it lacks an overall strategy to control development in a way that ensures that the existing high quality environment is retained. We have looked at the plan and imagined that if every site was fully developed as is planned then the city of Nelson would be changed completely through overdevelopment, the environmental costs would be extreme. Nelson is a green attractive city with many wonderful gardens with established trees and open spaces and it seems that no safeguards exist in the plan to acknowledge and value these. We believe that with consideration of the points listed [below S627.002 - S627.004] and greater council and community involvement in broadening the scope of the plan for the future development of Nelson, that greater intensification can be achieved but it must not be at the cost of the existing quality environment and living standards. We think a new vision is required for the future of Nelson and this plan with enhancements can be part of that.	Reject	Section 13
2515	S627.002	Philip Guy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Request the council consider the undertaking of a spatial plan for each Nelson neighbourhood which records the existing buildings, topography and open / public spaces and identifies areas for improvement and intensification which can be undertaken without compromising existing amenities.	To recognise that Nelson encompasses many different built environments and communities and the proposed broad brush approach does not in any meaningful way address this. Each neighbourhood should have it's own spatial plan with identified outcomes as a way of planning future developments to build on existing attributes and enhance areas that require improvements.	Reject	Section 13
2516	S628.004	Janet Whittington	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject everything about PC29 100% in its entirety.	Refer to all submission points and the original submission.	Reject	Section 9
2517	S628.005	Janet Whittington	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Request that NCC maintain NZ's unique low rise lifestyle and identity, so attractive to the world wide population and tourists in particular.	HDZ in the inner city seems less intrusive on the publics personal lives. That the city is for people not buildings and egos. In the 19thC, the English left England to put the 'Coronation St' style housing rows behind. In the 20thC, worldwide, Nelson is in the top 10 places for the northern hemisphere to migrate to (without assistance), partly due to weather [sun], lifestyle and benign politics.	Accept in part	Section 12
2518	S628.006	Janet Whittington	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Request council] retain as much of our planting as possible - the trees bordering our inner city streets and rivers in particular.	This will need to be written into PC29 for future people to rely on the long term, given our lack of accurate information on sea level impacts and the suddenness of the PC29 proposal.	Reject	Section 13

2519	S628.009	Janet Whittington	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Seeks that] the ruling to refuse consideration for small businesses [that bring in tourism] to be lifted in the PC29 and to maintain our livelihoods where they rely on tourism.	Relying on tourism relates all of us, as the tourist ticket price is converted into the purchase of Nelson goods and services by the Nelson staff and manager, which keeps local commerce afloat. Unlike bank loans where the principal and interest goes to Australia. The affluent 20thC, Christchurch public have been coming here for their Christmas holidays, and settling here for retirement. This century, internationally as well, we are a tourist destination. This isn't changing anytime soon, if we keep the Nelson we all love. Tourism is one of the main income arms for the Nelson/Tasman area. Unlike forestry, where the money flows out of the region in the hands of a very few, the tourism is attracted here by dozens of small operators, each mostly spending their profit in the region. Tourism is a crucial financial artery. You think there are empty shops now? It will be much worse if our attractive unique identity is turned into ''banality, like all the other modern cities in the world. How do we keep our charming mix of Victorian/Bungalow elegance, green landscape, humane building proportions? By building low level 1 storey infill.	Reject	Section 13
2520	S628.010	Janet Whittington	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Suggests council] build on top of industrial areas close to suburbs and build above Vanguard St.	The new Briscoe's building in the Warehouse/Countdown area of the city could have been 3- 6 stories and not affected other residential housing. Against the hills above Vanguard St doesn't contribute any more shade than the hill itself.	Reject	Section 12
2521	S628.011	Janet Whittington	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the high density zone in the city - specifically Trafalgar and Hardy Streets.	We are sunny Nelson not daylight Nelson. High density in the city means 2'hours/day of direct sunlight in the roads and carparks in the city. This goes against who we are as a province and a city. Trafalgar and Hardy Sts, the most popular streets in the city, should be left as sunny as they are now.	Accept in part	Section 12
2522	S628.014	Janet Whittington	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Requests climate change issues be addressed.	Address the anathema between greenfield's and buildings. The flood level overlay shows Nelson city under water in floods, so building in the flood zones doesn't make sense. Existing and heritage trees should be retained. We need frequent green spaces in the CBD too.	Accept in part	Section 13
2523	S628.015	Janet Whittington	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Information from NCC [on the changes to the building act] is requested for public digestion before the PC29 is passed.	Changing the building act changes our ability to react on climate change reactions. How does this affect the city? We need more time to learn more about this.	Reject	Section 13
2524	S628.017	Janet Whittington	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Requests council] have a neighbourhood plan change before government imposed plan change.	MP Rachel Boyack mentioned this at the Trafalgar Park meeting 7th Sept. Please make information on this public. Discussions are great for neighbourhood bonding as well. Bonding is essential for us to help ourselves in climate crises.	Reject	Section 13
2525	S628.018	Janet Whittington	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Requests] parks every 200m (ideally) from dwellings, especially where only 20% of property land use is free for growing food, flowers and lawns etc on sections, as in the current plan.	a. Parks and green space prevents flooding. We will need more of this everywhere with the increase in flooding everywhere throughout the CBD and suburbs. b. Privately owned tanks could take roof-rain-water, rather than forced into stormwater, which takes unwanted harmful toxins into the harbour. I request this in the plan. c. Stop developers from levelling the site, and selling the topsoil. Clay movement is increased when topsoil is not there to take up the stormwaters. d. The public should be notified if a green space/park/playground is sold into private hands. I have been told that a (Nelson local) construction company bought a park from the Auckland City Council to fill with houses, rather than get consent. The council chose to sell it to the company. Rather than consume time and wages for each park, we can request that this one event be legislated against in the plan for Nelson.	Reject	Section 11

2526	S629.001	Samuel Nevin	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support the objectives and overall intention of the proposed plan change in principle. This includes support for the provisions enabling urban intensification, the differing residential zones and associated standards (and the implied outcome of less urban sprawl type development), as well as the avoidance of risk in relation to natural hazards. I seek that the Council consider some minor changes raised in my other submission points.	Enabling intensification will promote a well-functioning and more vibrant urban environment, with better social, economic, climate and environmental outcomes. This will reduce urban sprawl and the associated adverse outcomes of that type of development, including higher costs (transport, infrastructure, climate), less social cohesion and less vibrant urban places.	Accept in part	Section 13
2527	S630.001	Ruby Hall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	I reject PC 29 in its entirety.	Refer to reasons in submission point S630.002.	Reject	Section 12
2528	FS5.002	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 9
2529	FS31.006	Stephen Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2530	FS72.006	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. This plan is out of step with the NZ Central Government's proposed plans for development. The NZ Government has indicated a lack of support for the previous Government's position on densification. Until more direction is given, this has the potential to be a waste of Council and Ratepayers' funds and time following an outdated Central Government brief. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
2531	FS66.008	Carol Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2532	FS61.006	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13

2533	FS76.006	Robert Stevenson(1)		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2534	FS54.006	Nicole Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2535	FS53.006	Susan Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2536	FS46.006	Dan McGuire		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2537	FS77.006	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2538	FS58.006	Robert Stevenson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2539	FS60.006	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13

2540	S630.002	Ruby Hall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2541	S630.003	Ruby Hall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
2542	S630.004	Ruby Hall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
2543	S630.006	Ruby Hall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S630.005.	Reject	Section 13
2544	S630.010	Ruby Hall	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
2545	S630.011	Ruby Hall	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 12
2546	FS28.042	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 in part	Section 12
2547	S630.013	Ruby Hall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
2548	S630.018	Ruby Hall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S630.005 and S630.011.	Reject	Section 13

2549	S630.019	Ruby Hall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2550	S630.027	Ruby Hall	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
2551	S630.029	Ruby Hall	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2552	S630.030	Ruby Hall	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2553	S630.031	Ruby Hall	Mapping	Oppose	Delete the medium density residential zone and high-density residential Zone from Tahunanui Hills.	I strongly oppose the Medium and High Density intensification in the Tahunanui Hills area (Tosswill, Tamaki, Chamberlian, etc).	Accept in part	Section 12
2554	FS61.091	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- removal of MDZ and HDZ from tahunanui hills. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- as above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2555	FS72.095	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- removal of MDZ and HDZ from Tahunanui hills. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- as above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2556	FS60.087	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- removal of MDZ and HDZ from tahunanui hills. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- as above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2557	S631.001	Shea Gillison	Residential Zones	Support	[Support] the General ResidentialZone.	I strongly advocate for the implementation of the plan change for the General Residential Zone (GRZ) as it aligns with the community's needs and supports well planned housing intensification. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
2558	S631.004	Shea Gillison	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Establish an Urban Design agency or provide greater influence to the existing Urban Design Panel to ensure thoughtful and considered design outcomes are achieved in the Medium Residential Zone (MRZ), High Residential Zone (HRZ), and Inner City Zones.	I emphasize the importance of oversight from design professionals to guide the development within these zones. Design professionals can bring their expertise to the table, helping to shape housing and infrastructure in a way that respects and enhances the character of our city.	Accept	Section 13

2559	S632.002	Fred Greig	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Seek [council] give a greater number of home owners security that they will not be adversely effect by large multi-floored buildings being erected near them to the disadvantage of their properties.	I am concerned that home owners in obviously residential areas should have confidence that multi-storied buildings will not be erected in their areas. I am thinking of such places as large parts of Stoke, and also residential parts of Tahunanui, Atawhai, and the Wood, (and no doubt numerous other parts of the city). People in such areas should have the security of knowing that large buildings will not be erected near their property. While it is very undesirable for productive land to be used for housing, it is also important that homeowners are not intimidated by the threat of large buildings near them. I think Plan Change 29 could be too heavy handed, and may need to be moderated.	Reject	Section 12
2560	S633.001	Alexander Seton	Infrastructure	Support in part	[Carry out] infrastructure planning to accomodated the proposed changes.	The plan needs further development, including prior infrastructure planning to accommodate the proposed changes.	Reject	Section 11
2561	S634.001	David Maurice	Entire Plan Change	Support	[Support Plan Change 29].	I'm actually pretty stoked about this whole Nelson Plan Change 29 thing. It's like, finally, we're getting some upgrades to our city, you know? Like, who doesn't want better infrastructure and cooler spaces to hang out? Let's break it down. So, first off, the zoning changes - they're lit! I mean, don't get me wrong, single-family homes are cool and all, but with the rising population, we need more housing options. Those high-rise apartments? They're gonna give us millennials some affordable living spaces close to all the action Plus, it's a win for sustainability. Smaller spaces, better for the planet, right? And the traffic improvements? I'm all for it. Like, who wants to be stuck in traffic for hours? Better roads, improved intersections - that means we can actually get to work or hit up those trendy cafes without losing our minds. It's a major win for our sanity. Now, the green spaces, they're like an Instagram dream come true! I can already see myself chilling in these new parks, taking cute pics, and enjoying some quality time with friends. It's a breath of fresh air in our concrete jungle, and who doesn't want a little green in their life? But what really gets me hyped about Plan Change 29 is the forward-thinking. We're making our city more attractive to young talent, entrepreneurs, and, well, hipsters. This change is gonna make Nelson even more vibrant and diverse. It's the kind of place I want to be, and I'm all in for that. So, let's embrace the change, people. Nelson Plan Change 29 is like the upgrade we've been waiting for - a total game-changer for our city. Let's keep riding that wave of progress and make Nelson the best place for millennials and everyone else! 🌟💯🏙️ #NelsonUpgrade #ChangeIsGood	Accept in part	Section 9
2562	S635.001	Lynette Buckley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose] Plan change 29.	Buildings should not be higher than 2 storeys. Too many people coming to live here for the hospitals and schools to cope.	Reject	Section 12
2563	S636.001	Alexander Buckley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose] Plan change 29.	Buildings should not be higher than 2 storeys. Too many people coming to live here for the schools and hospitals to cope.	Reject	Section 12
2564	S637.001	Andrew Buckley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose] Change 29.	Buildings should not be higher than 2 storeys.	Reject	Section 12
2565	S637.002	Andrew Buckley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose] Change 29.	Too many people coming to live here for the schools and particularly the hospital to cope.	Reject	Section 9
2566	S638.003	Vernon Patterson and Diana Russell	Entire Plan Change	Amend	To review in total Plan Change 29.	This plan has the potential to discourage new families and prompt current ones to move away, as well as creating angst and division when people decide to sell potentially to the detriment of our neighbours and the social fabric so vital to wellbeing. The Stoke business hub is not a large city CBD with large office blocks employing hundreds of workers who require housing nearby. Already there is a large Kainga Ora project planned for Neale Avenue which we support in principle as the block of land is appropriate for this type of development and we recognize the need for all families to enjoy safe homes and environments. This too will add to the need for community resources e.g. Doctors, library and schools and risks overloading the capacity of these services.	Reject	Section 9

2567	S641.002	Jeanette Hancock	Entire Plan Change	Amend	[Seeks] council rethink PC29 and listen carefullyto everyone who have made submissions. There are some very concerned ratepayers out there.	From past experience South St residents know big developers with their own architects and property consultants, have ways and means of getting around council rules, daylight hours/angles etc. These building and precincts need to be protected at all costs and those who live in them need assurance they will not lose sunshine hours or have to put up with light and noise pollution.	Reject	Section 13
2568	S642.001	Moira Petersen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Oppose] The Plan Change process.	The time frame given for submissions, even with the extended deadline of 31 October is minimal, given that residents now must catch up with the proposed PC29 at this late stage of the proceedings. That means accessing and understanding the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation. That access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 Evaluation report has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer, and require a paper document. This is contravention of the Local Government Act 2002, Section 5 (3). It is the community that makes Nelson. The people who live, work, pay rates, pay taxes, raise children, retire and devote countless hours of voluntary work that makes Nelson the place that it is. This community is shocked to learn that NCC is proposing to put multistory buildings in existing residential areas. This leaves people living with the prospect of losing sun, privacy and loss of property value at any time and the enormous anxiety that produces. Residents may sell up and leave and newcomers may not be keen to buy with that kind of uncertainty attached to property here.	Reject	Section 13
2569	S642.002	Moira Petersen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Oppose] the make-up of the hearing panel.	I perceive the proposed panel to be 'biased' and ask the Council to appoint Comissioners who can demonstrate an unbiased view.	Reject	Section 13
2570	S642.003	Moira Petersen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Seeks] Council to make significant amendments to PC 29 and create a new plan more sympathetic to the residents and the environment of Nelson, using submissions and further discussions presented to inform their decision.	PC 29 has the potential to hugely change the look and feel of Nelson. It is a very special and unique place that needs to be protected with care. It's heritage centre and surrounding colonial homes create a beauty and a good feel vibe that is valuable for locals and tourists alike. Re-zoning and rule changing is a simplistic broad-brush approach to intensification. This approach will lead to developer led expediency that lacks the coherence of a well-planned city.	Reject	Section 13
2571	S642.004	Moira Petersen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seeks] council to use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its housing needs assessment accordingly.	Population is a pivotal aspect concerning the scale at which Nelson needs to enable intensification and growth. The projection used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but is an over inflated projection that requires the scale of intensification to be greater than that of Statistics NZ. The M.E 2023 report for Nelson shows that there is a huge discrepancy between Statistics NZ's medium projection and the numbers suggested by Nelson Council.	Reject	Section 10
2572	S642.007	Moira Petersen	Residential Zones	Not Stated	[Seeks] to ensure intensification will allow for easy access to amenities, ensures allowance for maximum light, sun, privacy and usablebalconies, caters for diversity, creates green space, provides storage, consideration for carparking.	Intercity public transport is abysmal and likely to remain so for quite some time. Elegant and beautiful buildings, surrounded by green space, distanced from neighboring buildings allow maximum light, sun and privacy. Accommodate Nelsons aging population. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject in part	Section 12
2573	S643.001	Rosemary Jones	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Oppose the High Density Residential Zone for Nile Street, Trafalgar, and Bronte Street and seek that these are removed from this zoning.	Not stated.	Accept in part	Section 12
2574	S643.002	Rosemary Jones	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Oppose high density housing in any established residential area in the inner city.	I ask that high density housing is across several suburbs not concentrated all in the inner city. Controlled growth in Nelson area so that schools, hospital housing and employment and infrastructure are all considered and can cope.	Accept in part	Section 12

2575	S643.004	Rosemary Jones	Residential Zones	Amend	[Suggests] council develop medium density housing on the vacant land in the city fringe area.	This land is currently on the market and I believe is under offer. This land is boarded by Brittania heights, Lucus Terrace, and Washington Valley. It has a sunny aspect, views, walking distance to town and is on a bus route. To my knowledge there has not been any slips in this area. Could council make available a corner of a reserve for medium density housing e.g. Corner beach road and the road going into nature land. this site would not affect anyones sunlight, plenty of outdoor space. Coastal inundation could be a reason not to consider it. Luxury appartments have recently been built in close proximity to this suggested site.	Reject	Section 12
2576	S643.005	Rosemary Jones	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose] The national policy statement on Urban Development. Nelson comes under Policy 2 and the criteria of Policy 3 must not be used for Nelson.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 9
2577	S644.003	Brian Muldoon	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose] the Plan Change.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 9
2578	S645.001	Wayne and Jennifer Jackson	Residential Zones	Amend	Leave the current NRMP regulations in place for the General Residential Zone.	This submission is to oppose the proposed changes in the General Residential Zone (GRZ) and is based on the significant impact that it will have on existing properties, especially dwellings on rear (back) sections. The effect of Plan 29 changes in the General Residential Zone is that a residential dwelling,(or dwellings) will be able to be built on the section in front, half a metre greater in maximum height, one metre instead of one and a half metres from the front boundary, and reach maximum building height of 8 metres at 4.7 metres from the front boundary instead of 8.2 metres for a building 7.5 metres high as currently permitted. Daylight recession angles increase from 30% to 45% on both sides of any proposed building (s) which is significant. The negative impact on our living environment and that of similar properties will be as follows: A significant loss of daily sunshine hours especially in winter months, Lower floor bed and living rooms will lose sun virtually all year round, Less personal wellbeing through loss of sunshine, Greater energy use and cost for heating and lighting, Negated installation of solar energy, Loss of privacy, increased noise and overall loss of quiet enjoyment, Significant loss of current view, Potential decrease of capital value. We submit that properties on back sections are further disadvantaged by being subjected to one metre setbacks and daylight recession plane increases on all four boundaries which compound the above. [The current NRMP rules] have served the area most satisfactorily for a very long time and afforded rate payers a fair and good standard of living environment. Many significant decisions that have a huge impact on property owners and other persons lives have been based on this criteria and the radical changes	Reject	Section 9
2579	S645.004	Wayne and Jennifer Jackson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise intensification within the Inner City and on a localised basis in which new development must retain the amenity of existing properties [inferred].	We would like to see [intensification] undertaken on a more localised area basis commencing in the inner city rather than an overall wider zone type approach. To be carried out on a "design of buildings within areas "basis that give existing property owners reasonable protection of sunshine hours and their living environment rather than an overall "one criteria for all" concept. Irrespective it is essential that Nelson's heritage, unique and special characteristics be retained	Accept in part	Section 12

2580	S646.001	Angela Pattinson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reconsider Plan Change 29 and:	I strongly oppose changes to daylight angles/ recession planes and boundary adjustments in the general residential zones. My husband 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. Should the proposed plan changes be implemented the current daylight hours and recession planes would be grossly diminished, which would be extremely distressing resulting in the following impacts to the property. Loss of direct sunlight into the kitchen, dining, living areas. And to the main bedroom at certain times of the day. Direct natural sunlight is essential for well-being. Loss of value to our property. Increased use of power for heating and lighting. Currently the floor to ceiling windows in th, dining, living areas significantly help to heat the house. Restricted light for solar energy which would negate the installation of solar panels. Loss of quiet enjoyment due to increased noise. These effects would be detrimental to overall wellbeing. Furthermore, properties on a back section have an added disadvantage by being subjected to one-meter setbacks and daylight recession plane increases on all four boundaries, which compound the above impacts. While I do understand the need for housing intensification, I believe that the current regulations have worked well for the general zone and have provided protection for ratepayers from the above-mentioned impacts. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
2581	S646.003	Angela Pattinson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend Plan Change 29] so that the inner city is the starting point to have the most significant intensification, before considering any changes to the residential neighbourhoods.	Refer to reasons in submission point S646.001.	Reject	Section 10
2582	S647.003	Christopher Fitchett	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] that the hearing panel consist of three independent members, one of whom should be a Nelson resident.	The proposal to have the submissions heard by three commissioners, two of whom are councillors is fundamentally flawed. The two proposed councillors have been involved in developing the plan, and will be involved in the final adoption of the plan, therefore how can they go into the process with a unbiased view on it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2583	S648.001	Clayton Munting	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support the new High density residential zone (HRZ) areas proposed under PC29.	These are city fringe properties where more intensive residential development is warranted in order to create a vibrant inner city and reduce urban sprawl into productive rural land.	Suport in part	Section 9
2584	S648.003	Clayton Munting	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Draw up neighbourhood plans for the city which outline the specific design goals for each area and are overseen by a Independent Design Committee, rather than allowing a site-by-site piecemeal Developer driven approach to intensification.	I was involved in "Vinegar Lane" an intensive redevelopment project on the old Vinegar works site in Ponsonby. These are small freehold sites with a max height of four floors, set around an owner's reserve and where each design had to be approved by a Design Committee and the result is a well-designed cohesive precinct. PC29 is our Christchurch (post earthquakes) moment to redefine the shape of Nelson into the future ... a piecemeal Developer driven approach will surely disappoint.	Accept	Section 13
2585	S648.005	Clayton Munting	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Remove the pine trees on Haulashore Island and replant with pohutakawa.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2586	S649.001	Warren and Barbara Chippendale	Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove the MDZ and HDZ from Tahunanui Hill [inferred].	I cannot speak to the advantages or disadvantages of plan change 29 in other neighbourhoods. A change in the plan in the Tahunanui hillside certainly would be a disadvantage. We strongly object to any change to the plan that increases housing density in the Tahunanui hillside.	Reject	Section 12
2587	S651.001	Kaye Hill	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Support part of Plan Change 29, subject to further work and consultation.	I support part of the plan but further work and consultation is required.	Reject	Section 13

2588	S651.002	Kaye Hill	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Establish a combined Nelson-Tasman Urban Development Agency and implement other recommendations from Nelson Tasman 2050 Urban Development document.	I support the Nelson Tasman 2050 Urban Development document as attached to the original submission.	Accept	Section 9
2589	S651.004	Kaye Hill	Entire Plan Change	Support	[Prioritise] intensification of CBD with housing and green areas.	I support intensification of CBD with housing and green areas.	Accept	Section 9
2590	S651.005	Kaye Hill	Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove High Density zoning from Heritage Precincts.	Heritage precincts shouldn't be high density areas - should be heritage site different rating.	Accept in part	Section 12
2591	S652.007	Graeme Tyree	Residential Zones	Support in part	[Enable creation of] "pocket parks".	Reserves become a more important urban resource when building coverage is increased on residential sections. Opportunities should be taken to include "pocket parks" as older houses are demolished and land uses change.	Accept in part	Section 12
2592	S652.010	Graeme Tyree	Residential Zones	Support	Support intensification in the transition zone between the CBD and outer suburbs.	I support intensification in the transition zone between the CBD and outer suburbs. Townhouses with shared walls are a good option and are thermally efficient.	Accept	Section 12
2593	S652.012	Graeme Tyree	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Building up to six storeys should be primarily located in the CBD and nearby streets with development of 2-4 storeys in residential areas surrounding the CBD.	Plan 29 has many good points, but does need some fine tuning. The older, more dilapidated houses in a street will be the first to be redeveloped, and having new dwellings of two to four storeys will be a welcome enhancement to the supply of accommodation in Nelson City. Building up to six storeys should be primarily located in the CBD and nearby streets. As citizens become more comfortable with seeing the initial developments of this size, they will become normalised. Increasing the numbers of people residing in the urban central zones will assist us in meeting greenhouse gas reduction targets, while making active and public transport options more attractive to use.	Accept in part	Section 12
2594	S653.001	Jeremy Thompson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	I reject the proposed Plan Change 29 in its entirety for the following 2 major sets of reasons: 1. Climate change responsibility and NZ's commitment: There is uniform acceptance that the combination of population growth, industrialisation and consumerism have caused planet Earth's climate to change with that change beginning to accelerate with catastrophic evidence all around the globe. Proposed Plan Change 29 demonstrates that Nelson City Council cannot grasp the need for fundamentally different thinking and perpetuates the prioritisation of economic metrics ahead of climate change responsibility. This is one fundamental basis for me being wholly opposed to Plan Change 29. 2. Total opposition to proposed plan change 29 Proposed Plan Change 29 would allow the insertion of 3 storey in medium density areas and 6 storey dwellings in high density areas, amongst Nelson's conventional housing stock. This blend would be an architectural dogs breakfast and would desecrate the aesthetic value of much of Nelson's historic housing stock when viewed street by street. In proposed medium density and high density areas, Plan Change 29 would result in existing properties losing direct sunlight through either all of the year or significantly increased portions of it due to higher buildings being crammed in close to the boundary. The erection of a 3 or 6 storey building close to the boundary would inevitably reduce or remove this quality of that property. An inevitable result of Plan Change 29 would be a lessening of the sense of community that many streets value. There is a moral question of the right of Nelson City Council to propose a Plan Change (29) that allows non-residents who have yet to arrive, to be the cause of reduced quality of life and property values for	Reject	Section 9

2595	S653.002	Jeremy Thompson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise or mandate intensification within the City Centre and City Fringe and no intensification of dwellings should be permitted outside these areas.	The expansion of Nelson's urban sprawl needs to stop. If the stock of dwellings has to be increased then intensification of Nelson's Inner City Centre and Inner City Fringe should be incentivised or mandated. Increased numbers of residents in the central city area is environmentally superior to increased numbers in the suburbs for such obvious reasons as access to work places, services and amenities. Transport is by foot or bike compared to additional motorised transport required from urban areas on already clogged roadways.	Reject	Section 13
2596	S654.001	Romneya Gammie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29 in its entirety.	Re-zoning and rule changing is an overly simplistic broad-brush approach to urban intensification. This latter is a task that requires much area-by-area design and case-by-case fine tuning. The plan change 29 proposal lays the city open to developer-led expediency that lacks the coherence and elegance of a well-planned city.	Reject	Section 9
2597	S654.002	Romneya Gammie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Implement] a governance-led model for intensification that ensures a principled approach to the task and includes well-researched and imaginative city design.	Refer to reasons in submission point S656.001.	Accept in part	Section 13
2598	S654.003	Romneya Gammie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	· Establish a Statement of Principles that must be adhered to for all intensification activity [Principles include: Localisation, Sensitivity, Environmental Integrity, Social Equity].	Nelson City's intensification plan should be committed to the following principles: 1. Localization: - Intensification must not degrade the surroundings and living conditions of existing residents. - Plans for any neighbourhood must be locally agreed to by that neighbourhood. - Short distances to amenities. - Assessment of capacity of essential amenities in existing commercial centres. 2. Liveability: - Community wellbeing is greatly enhanced by a variety of ages, genders, ethnicities. - Green space and attractive local gathering places. - Inner city high rise must create new green space. - Permeability is essential. 3. Sensitivity: - Attractive character enhances human wellbeing. - Beauty and elegance enhance human happiness. - Concentration of a single demographic brings social problems. - Preservation of historic areas and buildings enhances the city. 4. Environmental integrity: - Minimal use of concrete construction will lower building carbon emissions. - Topography is one of Nelson's assets. - Climate change is likely to bring extreme weather so 'sponge city' principles will be necessary. - Planning by landscape architects will be needed. 5. Social Equity: - Lower income neighbourhoods are often viewed as less deserving. - Intensification in lower income areas must be done with sensitivity. - Intensification should help eliminate 'lower income areas' by mixing the population more evenly. [Refer to original submission for more detail].	Accept in part	Section 12
2599	S654.008	Romneya Gammie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Let people build and live in self contained granny flats.	None stated.	Reject	Section 9
2600	FS28.141	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Let people build and live in self contained 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
2601	FS38.020	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support in part are: Let people build and live in self contained 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 in part	Section 9

2602	S655.001	Rosemary Griffin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	I ask Council to withdraw PC 29 and redraft the plan before again, seeking public submissions.	I oppose PC 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
2603	S655.002	Rosemary Griffin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Implement the suggestion of Nelson Taman 2050 to appoint a Nelson-Tasman Urban Development Agency (NT-UDA).	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2604	S655.003	Rosemary Griffin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Building on submission point S655.002,] task the Nelson-Tasman UrbanDevelopment Agency with leading the re-drafting of an intensification planchange.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2605	S656.001	Darren Gammie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	Re-zoning and rule changing is an overly simplistic broad-brush approach to urban intensification. This latter is a task that requires much area-by-area design and case-by-case fine tuning. The plan change 29 proposal lays the city open to developer-led expediency that lacks the coherence and elegance of a well-planned city.	Reject	Section 9
2606	S656.002	Darren Gammie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Implement] a governance-led model for intensification that ensures a principled approach to the task and includes well-researched and imaginative city design.	Refer to reasons in submission point S656.001.	Accept in part	Section 13
2607	S656.003	Darren Gammie	Entire Plan Change	Amend	· Establish a Statement of Principles that must be adhered to for all intensification activity [Principles include: Localisation, Sensitivity, Environmental Integrity, Social Equity].	Nelson City's intensification plan should be committed to the following principles: 1. Localization: - Intensification must not degrade the surroundings and living conditions of existing residents. - Plans for any neighbourhood must be locally agreed to by that neighbourhood. - Short distances to amenities. - Assessment of capacity of essential amenities in existing commercial centres. 2. Liveability: - Community wellbeing is greatly enhanced by a variety of ages, genders, ethnicities. - Green space and attractive local gathering places. - Inner city high rise must create new green space. - Permeability is essential. 3. Sensitivity: - Attractive character enhances human wellbeing. - Beauty and elegance enhance human happiness. - Concentration of a single demographic brings social problems. - Preservation of historic areas and buildings enhances the city. 4. Environmental integrity: - Minimal use of concrete construction will lower building carbon emissions. - Topography is one of Nelson's assets. - Climate change is likely to bring extreme weather so 'sponge city' principles will be necessary. - Planning by landscape architects will be needed. 5. Social Equity: - Lower income neighbourhoods are often viewed as less deserving. - Intensification in lower income areas must be done with sensitivity. - Intensification should help eliminate 'lower income areas' by mixing the population more evenly. [Refer to original submission for more detail].	Accept in part	Section 12
2608	S657.001	Peter Kemp	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	Re-zoning and rule changing is an overly simplistic broad-brush approach to urban intensification. This latter is a task that requires much area-by-area design and case-by-case fine tuning. The plan change 29 proposal lays the city open to developer-led expediency that lacks the coherence and elegance of a well-planned city.	Reject	Section 9
2609	S657.002	Peter Kemp	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Implement] a governance-led model for intensification that ensures a principled approach to the task and includes well-researched and imaginative city design.	Refer to reasons in submission point S656.001.	Accept in part	Section 13

2610	S657.003	Peter Kemp	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	· Establish a Statement of Principles that must be adhered to for all intensification activity [Principles include: Localisation, Sensitivity, Environmental Integrity, Social Equity].	Nelson City's intensification plan should be committed to the following principles: 1. Localization: - Intensification must not degrade the surroundings and living conditions of existing residents. - Plans for any neighbourhood must be locally agreed to by that neighbourhood. - Short distances to amenities. - Assessment of capacity of essential amenities in existing commercial centres. 2. Liveability: - Community wellbeing is greatly enhanced by a variety of ages, genders, ethnicities. - Green space and attractive local gathering places. - Inner city high rise must create new green space. - Permeability is essential. 3. Sensitivity: - Attractive character enhances human wellbeing. - Beauty and elegance enhance human happiness. - Concentration of a single demographic brings social problems. - Preservation of historic areas and buildings enhances the city. 4. Environmental integrity: - Minimal use of concrete construction will lower building carbon emissions. - Topography is one of Nelson's assets. - Climate change is likely to bring extreme weather so 'sponge city' principles will be necessary. - Planning by landscape architects will be needed. 5. Social Equity: - Lower income neighbourhoods are often viewed as less deserving. - Intensification in lower income areas must be done with sensitivity. - Intensification should help eliminate 'lower income areas' by mixing the population more evenly. [Refer to original submission for more detail].	Accept in part	Section 12
2611	S658.004	Adam Hills	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 S658.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2612	S658.006	Adam Hills	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S658.001 and S658.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2613	S658.011	Adam Hills	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S658.009 and S658.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
2614	S659.004	Lauran Allen	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 S659.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2615	S659.006	Lauran Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S659.001 and S659.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2616	S659.007	Lauran Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2617	S659.008	Lauran Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2618	S660.004	Anna Allen	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 S660.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2619	S660.006	Anna Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S660.001 and S660.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2620	S660.007	Anna Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2621	S660.008	Anna Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13

2622	S661.004	Jasmine Smythe-Ross	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 S661.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2623	S661.006	Jasmine Smythe-Ross	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S661.001 and S661.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2624	S661.007	Jasmine Smythe-Ross	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2625	S661.008	Jasmine Smythe-Ross	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2626	S662.004	Joe Caponte	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 S662.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2627	S662.006	Joe Caponte	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S662.001 and S662.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2628	S662.007	Joe Caponte	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2629	S662.008	Joe Caponte	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2630	S663.004	Peter Smillie	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 S663.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2631	S663.006	Peter Smillie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S663.001 and S663.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2632	S663.007	Peter Smillie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2633	S663.008	Peter Smillie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2634	S664.004	Rachel Duke	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 S664.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2635	S664.006	Rachel Duke	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S664.001 and S664.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2636	S664.011	Rachel Duke	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S664.009 and S664.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
2637	S665.004	Marianne Palmer	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 S665.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2638	S665.006	Marianne Palmer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S665.001 and S665.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2639	S665.007	Marianne Palmer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13

2640	S665.008	Marianne Palmer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2641	S665.010	Marianne Palmer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC 29 in its entirety.	Refer to reasons in submission point S665.011.	Reject	Section 9
2642	S665.011	Marianne Palmer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2643	S665.012	Marianne Palmer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
2644	S665.013	Marianne Palmer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
2645	S665.015	Marianne Palmer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S665.014.	Reject	Section 13
2646	S665.019	Marianne Palmer	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
2647	S665.021	Marianne Palmer	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 12
2648	FS28.142	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Let people build and live in self contained 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
2649	S665.023	Marianne Palmer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
2650	S665.028	Marianne Palmer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S665.014 and S665.021.	Reject	Section 13

2651	S665.029	Marianne Palmer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2652	S665.037	Marianne Palmer	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
2653	S665.039	Marianne Palmer	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2654	S665.040	Marianne Palmer	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2655	S666.004	Graeme Cowan	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 S666.001. Any high rise buildings for the housing crisis will eventually be like Scotland and the UK slum areas, please learn from these mistakes.	Accept in part	Section 12
2656	S666.006	Graeme Cowan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S666.001 and S666.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2657	S666.007	Graeme Cowan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2658	S666.008	Graeme Cowan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2659	S667.004	Ian Lash	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 S667.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2660	S667.006	Ian Lash	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S667.001 and S667.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2661	S667.007	Ian Lash	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2662	S667.008	Ian Lash	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2663	S667.010	Ian Lash	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Suggest] carefully selecting an area where some high rise development could occur without developing a slum area and providing space for safe children's recreation.	Not enough accountability on developers wishing to build under these regulations.	Reject	Section 13

2664	S668.004	Peter Halligan	Residential Zones	Support	[Retain the] High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 12m.	I support the creation of a High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 12 m.	Accept in part	Section 12
2665	S668.006	Peter Halligan	Entire Plan Change	Support	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City and the current residential zones.	Nelson is particular is a very small geographical region and it is critical that more intensification for housing is adopted. [Individuals need to] be real and honest about the fact [that] we have a housing crisis that will only get worse. We cannot continue to keep building out and consider[ing] land that is unsuitable for construction or better land use.	Accept in part	Section 12
2666	S669.004	Stuart Mayer	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 S669.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2667	S669.006	Stuart Mayer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S669.001 and S669.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2668	S669.007	Stuart Mayer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2669	S669.008	Stuart Mayer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2670	S670.004	Mark Riley and Juliette Barrett	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 S670.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2671	S670.006	Mark Riley and Juliette Barrett	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S670.001 and S670.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2672	S670.007	Mark Riley and Juliette Barrett	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2673	S670.008	Mark Riley and Juliette Barrett	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2674	S670.009	Mark Riley and Juliette Barrett	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seek to] plan areas and communities where there is intensification. Ensure there are plenty of green spaces, car parking, room for people to walk.	Allowing planning to be rushed through quickly will only end in houses being built inadequately. It will only ever be about money. Never is it a consideration for the community that lives there or even the people that need housing. This is a very flawed and not well thought out plan. Slapping in developments in existing neighbourhoods makes it unsafe and erodes peoples quality of life. All families deserve to have places to play, not end up on the street where there is already a lot of traffic.	Reject	Section 13
2675	S671.004	Ron van der Lem	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 S671.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2676	S671.006	Ron van der Lem	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S671.001 and S671.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2677	S671.007	Ron van der Lem	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2678	S671.008	Ron van der Lem	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2679	S671.009	Ron van der Lem	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Lower the height of these buildings.	I object to all of these plans.	Reject	Section 9
2680	S672.004	Hilary van der Lem	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 S672.001.	Accept in part	Section 12

2681	S672.006	Hilary van der Lem	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S672.001 and S672.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2682	S672.007	Hilary van der Lem	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2683	S672.008	Hilary van der Lem	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2684	S673.004	Craig Helm	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 S673.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2685	S673.006	Craig Helm	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S673.001 and S673.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2686	S673.007	Craig Helm	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2687	S673.008	Craig Helm	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2688	S673.009	Craig Helm	Heritage	Oppose	[Seek to] maintain the character of Nelson.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 12
2689	S674.004	Ray and June Austin	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 S674.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2690	S674.006	Ray and June Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S674.001 and S674.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2691	S674.007	Ray and June Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2692	S674.008	Ray and June Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2693	S675.004	Margaret Meechang	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 S675.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2694	S675.006	Margaret Meechang	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S675.001 and S675.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2695	S675.007	Margaret Meechang	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2696	S675.008	Margaret Meechang	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2697	S675.012	Margaret Meechang	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Develop more 'satellite' areas, linked to towns by electric rail for commutors, as well as each area having their own hub.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 12
2698	S675.013	Margaret Meechang	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seek to] encourage 'long term' rentals like it's done overseas and encourage 'rent to buy' instead of making owning rental properties a 'business' option for rich people.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2699	S675.014	Margaret Meechang	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S675.015.	Reject	Section 13
2700	FS5.014	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 9

2701	S675.015	Margaret Meechang	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2702	S675.016	Margaret Meechang	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
2703	S675.017	Margaret Meechang	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
2704	S675.019	Margaret Meechang	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S675.018.	Reject	Section 13
2705	S675.023	Margaret Meechang	Mapping	Amend	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
2706	S675.024	Margaret Meechang	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 12
2707	FS28.043	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 in part	Section 12
2708	S675.026	Margaret Meechang	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
2709	S675.031	Margaret Meechang	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S675.018 and S675.024.	Reject	Section 13

2710	S675.032	Margaret Meechang	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2711	S675.040	Margaret Meechang	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
2712	S675.042	Margaret Meechang	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2713	S675.043	Margaret Meechang	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2714	S676.004	R. Sherrill	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 S676.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2715	S676.006	R. Sherrill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S676.001 and S676.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2716	S676.007	R. Sherrill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2717	S676.008	R. Sherrill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2718	S677.004	Justin Allen	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 S677.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2719	S677.006	Justin Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S677.001 and S677.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2720	S677.007	Justin Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2721	S677.008	Justin Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2722	S677.012	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 12
2723	S677.013	Justin Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seek that] all existing green spaces remain, [and are] not to be put into housing.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

2724	S677.014	Justin Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Plan [change] 29 shoudl be revised with proper public consultation.	I only just found out about it.	Reject	Section 13
2725	S677.016	Justin Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seek to build] social housing units on Karaka Orchard St.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2726	S678.004	Angela Clark	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 S678.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2727	S678.006	Angela Clark	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S678.001 and S678.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2728	S678.007	Angela Clark	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2729	S678.008	Angela Clark	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2730	S678.011	Angela Clark	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Redevelop] Karaka, Orchard, Murphy, Orsman Cres.	If you were to bulldoze Karaka, Orchard, Murphy, Orsman Cres, imagine how many you could actually house.	Reject	Section 12
2731	S679.004	Helena Barrow	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), has a max height greater than 12 m as it is not mandated under NPS-UD 2020. Refer to reasons in submission point S679.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2732	S679.006	Helena Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S679.001 and S679.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2733	S679.007	Helena Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2734	S679.008	Helena Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2735	S679.009	Helena Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend the rules to require] more green space in all new developments.	We need much more green space designated in all new developments (residential or otherwise) and for it to be more than a strip/cycleway. Humans need nature parks. No development should shade beach or ocean areas. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 11
2736	S679.010	Helena Barrow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Prioritise new development] in the CBD and previously non-residential areas.	Build up in the central business district and new developments in previously non-residential areas, i.e. 'agriculture' lease with Tasman on the flat.	Accept in part	Section 12
2737	S680.004	Pamela Ferguson	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 S680.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2738	S680.006	Pamela Ferguson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S680.001 and S680.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2739	S680.007	Pamela Ferguson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2740	S680.008	Pamela Ferguson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2741	S680.009	Pamela Ferguson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Utilise vacant land for affordable housing].	I have seen vacant land around the Nelson area where affordable houses could be built without impacting on existing houses, like Habitat for Humanity have done on Main Rd, Stoke.	Accept in part	Section 12
2742	S681.004	Michael Curnow	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 S681.001.	Accept in part	Section 12

2743	S681.006	Michael Curnow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S681.001 and S681.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2744	S681.007	Michael Curnow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2745	S681.008	Michael Curnow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2746	S682.004	Neil Hickling	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 S682.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2747	S682.006	Neil Hickling	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S682.001 and S682.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2748	S682.007	Neil Hickling	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2749	S682.008	Neil Hickling	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2750	S683.004	Helen and David Murphy	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 S683.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2751	S683.006	Helen and David Murphy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S683.001 and S683.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2752	S683.007	Helen and David Murphy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2753	S683.008	Helen and David Murphy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2754	S684.001	Edward Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S684.002.	Reject	Section 13
2755	S684.002	Edward Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2756	S684.003	Edward Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
2757	S684.004	Edward Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
2758	S684.006	Edward Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S684.005.	Reject	Section 13

2759	S684.010	Edward Short	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
2760	S684.011	Edward Short	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 12
2761	FS28.044	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 in part	Section 12
2762	S684.013	Edward Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
2763	S684.018	Edward Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S684.005 and S684.011.	Reject	Section 13
2764	S684.019	Edward Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2765	S684.027	Edward Short	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
2766	S684.029	Edward Short	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2767	S684.030	Edward Short	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2768	S685.001	Helen Winwood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S685.002.	Reject	Section 13

2769	S685.002	Helen Winwood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2770	S685.003	Helen Winwood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
2771	S685.004	Helen Winwood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
2772	S685.006	Helen Winwood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S685.005.	Reject	Section 13
2773	S685.010	Helen Winwood	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
2774	S685.011	Helen Winwood	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 12
2775	FS28.045	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 in part	Section 12
2776	S685.013	Helen Winwood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
2777	S685.018	Helen Winwood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S685.005 and S685.011.	Reject	Section 13

2778	S685.019	Helen Winwood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2779	S685.027	Helen Winwood	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
2780	S685.029	Helen Winwood	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2781	S685.030	Helen Winwood	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2782	S686.001	Christopher Knox	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S686.002.	Reject	Section 13
2783	S686.002	Christopher Knox	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2784	S686.003	Christopher Knox	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
2785	S686.004	Christopher Knox	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
2786	S686.006	Christopher Knox	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S686.005.	Reject	Section 13
2787	S686.010	Christopher Knox	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12

2788	S686.011	Christopher Knox	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 12
2789	FS28.046	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 in part	Section 12
2790	S686.013	Christopher Knox	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
2791	S686.018	Christopher Knox	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S686.005 and S686.011.	Reject	Section 13
2792	S686.019	Christopher Knox	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2793	S686.027	Christopher Knox	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
2794	S686.029	Christopher Knox	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2795	S686.030	Christopher Knox	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

2796	S687.001	Judith Bartsch	Mapping	Oppose	To remove Tamaki Street from the proposed high density residential zone and amend Tamaki Street area to medium density zone or less.	I specifically oppose the proposed change to high density residential zone for Tamaki street due to: The steepness of the street. Stability of the land. Lack of access to amenities, such as a supermarket, which is a key amenity for high density living. This area is also not walking distance to city centre or Stoke centre amenities and shops. Slips in neighbouring streets, such as Tosswill St. have impacted access to this area during the last Nelson flooding. Access into town over the hill was also limited by slips. The roads and hills are not currently fit for purpose for a substantial increase in use The loss of direct sunlight for this small residential area, which would have an impact. on the mental health of residents -- natural sunlight boosts serotonin levels and can help lift mood and prevent some mental health issues. The loss of direct sunlight would also in particular impact the residents living in the older homes in this area, potentially increasing the dampness and mould in those homes and the use and cost of heating to keep the homes warm.	Reject	Section 9
2797	S687.002	Judith Bartsch	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2798	S687.004	Judith Bartsch	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
2799	S687.006	Judith Bartsch	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S687.005.	Reject	Section 13
2800	S687.010	Judith Bartsch	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone, apart from a small area of central Nelson such as the city end of Milton Street.	I oppose the proposed change to high density residential zone for all new areas proposed, apart from a small area of central Nelson such as the city end of Milton Street. High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
2801	S687.011	Judith Bartsch	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 12
2802	FS28.047	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 in part	Section 12

2803	S687.013	Judith Bartsch	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
2804	S687.018	Judith Bartsch	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S687.005 and S687.011.	Reject	Section 13
2805	S687.019	Judith Bartsch	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2806	S687.027	Judith Bartsch	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
2807	S687.029	Judith Bartsch	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2808	S687.030	Judith Bartsch	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2809	S688.001	Jan Wickham and Graeme Muir	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Seek the qualitative controls on design advocated by the Chair of the Nelson Marlborough Branch of Te Kahui Whaihanga, NZ Institute of Architects, i.e. design led development rather than developers having a free hand.	We support the proposed plan change 29 for the following reasons: We support increased density by building up not out. We see it improving the economics and viability of public transport and infrastructure. It reduces the incursion of the city into productive land or land unsuitable for housing for a variety of reasons. We see it benefiting social interaction as neighbourhoods become more connected and have better facilities, such as walkways and cycle ways.	Reject	Section 13

2810	S689.001	William Stein and Cornelia Drast	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete the medium density residential zone and high-density residential Zone from Tahunanui Hills.	Oppose the proposed Medium Density and High Density Residential Zones on the Tahunanui Hills between Maire Street and Tamaki Street, and Tamaki Street to Winns Lane and Stansell Avenue. The road serving this part of Tahunanui are two narrow and have poor site lines. They are unsuitable for the increased traffic that will be generated by medium and high density housing, especially if no on site parking is required for these houses. Unfortunately, there is no longer any public transport on this part of the hills. Our local bus service was withdrawn after the August 2022 landslips and no longer comes through these proposed new zones. Existing stormwater and wastewater systems on the Tahunanui Hills are not designed for higher density housing. In recent years we have seen stormwater overflowing during high intensity rainfall events a into properties along Tahunanui Drive and Tosswill Road. Instability effects a swath of land (old sea cliff) through the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone and the High Density Residential Zone. The August 2022"atmospheric river of rain" event caused land slipping along Tosswill Road, Chamberlain Street and in the Tosswill Reserve. The slipping was significant enough to cause road closure. Denser housing development is likely to result in more land disturbance as building platforms are cut for these multiple housing projects. There has been insufficient consultation for such a major change in housing density and Nelson's residential areas.	Accept in part	Section 12
2811	FS61.041	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Oppose in part	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The road serving this part of Tahunanui are two narrow and have poor site lines. They are unsuitable for the increased traffic that will be generated by medium and high density housing, especially if no on site parking is required for these houses. Unfortunately, there is no longer any public transport on this part of the hills. Our local bus service was withdrawn after the August 2022 landslips and no longer comes through these proposed new zones. Existing stormwater and wastewater systems on the Tahunanui Hills are not designed for higher density housing. In recent years we have seen stormwater overflowing during high intensity rainfall events a into properties along Tahunanui Drive and Tosswill Road. Instability effects a swath of land (old sea cliff) through the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone and the High Density Residential Zone. The August 2022"atmospheric river of rain" event caused land slipping along Tosswill Road, Chamberlain Street and in the Tosswill Reserve. The slipping was significant enough to cause road closure. Denser housing development is likely to result in more land disturbance as building platforms are cut for these multiple housing projects. There has been insufficient consultation for such a major change in housing density and Nelson's residential areas. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support- Poor infrastructure and instability of area in Tahunanui hills.	Accept in part	Section 12

2812	FS72.044	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The road serving this part of Tahunanui are two narrow and have poor site lines. They are unsuitable f generated by medium and high density housing, especially if no on site parking is required for these h longer any public transport on this part of the hills. Our local bus service was withdrawn after the Aug comes through these proposed new zones. Existing stormwater and wastewater systems on the Tahunanui Hills are not designed for higher densi seen stormwater overflowing during high intensity rainfall events a into properties along Tahunanui Dr Instability effects a swath of land (old sea cliff) through the proposed Medium Density Residential Zon Zone. The August 2022"atmospheric river of rain" event caused land slipping along Tosswill Road, Cha Reserve. The slipping was significant enough to cause road closure. Denser housing development is li as building platforms are cut for these multiple housing projects. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support- Poor infrastructure and instability of area in Tahunanui hills.	Accept in part	Section 12
2813	FS60.036	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The road serving this part of Tahunanui are two narrow and have poor site lines. They are unsuitable for the increased traffic that will be generated by medium and high density housing, especially if no on site parking is required for these houses. Unfortunately, there is no longer any public transport on this part of the hills. Our local bus service was withdrawn after the August 2022 landslips and no longer comes through these proposed new zones. Existing stormwater and wastewater systems on the Tahunanui Hills are not designed for higher density housing. In recent years we have seen stormwater overflowing during high intensity rainfall events a into properties along Tahunanui Drive and Tosswill Road. Instability effects a swath of land (old sea cliff) through the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone and the High Density Residential Zone. The August 2022"atmospheric river of rain" event caused land slipping along Tosswill Road, Chamberlain Street and in the Tosswill Reserve. The slipping was significant enough to cause road closure. Denser housing development is likely to result in more land disturbance as building platforms are cut for these multiple housing projects. There has been insufficient consultation for such a major change in housing density and Nelson's residential areas. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support- Poor infrastructure and instability of area in Tahunanui hills. Delete the medium density residential zone and high-density residential Zone from Tahunanui Hills.	Accept in Part	Section 12
2814	S689.003	William Stein and Cornelia Drast	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Oppose the proposed new height limits, daylight angles, open space and yard requirements in the Medium and High Density Residential zones.	These rules are likely to cause overlooking, loss of privacy and lack of daylight.	Reject	Section 12
2815	S689.004	William Stein and Cornelia Drast	Mapping	Oppose	Medium and high density housing is best located near the large shopping centres and large open space reserves such as in Stoke and Nelson Central which are on flat land.	These locations are generally better served by public transport and other services.	Accept in part	Section 12
2816	S690.001	Rosemary and John Bealing	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC 29 in its entirety.	We reject PC 29 in its entirety. We feel that PC29, as proposed, is not acceptable for the future growth of Nelson City, and that many of the criteria used to decide what can be done, with no need for neighbours consent, is much too lax, and that NCC policy design staff need to readdress the whole exercise with more appropriate restrictions.	Reject	Section 9

2817	S690.002	Rosemary and John Bealing	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the HDZ from the plan completely [inferred].	We Oppose the creation of both the Medium and High Density Residential Zones (MDZ & HDZ), because of the height and the permitted intensity of the number of units allowed under the proposed plan changes. We feel that the new plan will alter the character and the living environment to such a degree that the whole reason for our returning to Nelson for its good climate and high annual sunshine will be lost if a number of 19.5m high structures were to be built on our boundary. We feel that the PC.29 proposal spreads the MDZ & HDZ over a far greater area than is needed, and that these taller buildings should be confined to the CBD, and only allowed to spread further once the CBD is considered "full". Health and Safety concerns, with regard to slipping on ice, will be another concern for elderly residents left-in houses in areas with numerous high rise structures. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
2818	S690.003	Rosemary and John Bealing	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Confine intensification and taller buildings to the CBD until the CBD is considered "full".	Refer to reasons in submission point S690.002. Given that Nelson City is only classified as a "second tier city", then there is no necessity to go to the proposed heights to accommodate more people.	Reject	Section 10
2819	S690.008	Rosemary and John Bealing	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Avoid building intensification on-self-draining, high quality, versatile soils that will grow a wide range of horticultural crops.	Such a soil exists on our and on our neighbours' properties.	Reject	Section 13
2820	S690.009	Rosemary and John Bealing	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the MDZ from the plan completely [inferred].	Refer to reasons in submission point S690.002.	Reject	Section 12
2821	S691.004	John Walker	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	[Requests council] start with six level [building heights] in the CBD only.	The CBD commercial area is suitable for six levels.	Reject	Section 10
2822	S691.006	John Walker	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose] Rohan O'Neill Stevens and Trudy Brand being appointed as commissioners and [request council] appoint three independent commissioners to be transparent.	Rohan O'Neill Stevens and Trudy Brand voted for the council to keep Plan 29 as is, this is not transparent.	Reject	Section 13
2823	S692.001	Helen Hoby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Rethink and rework Plan Change 29 based on the submissions.	Lack of early public engagement and consultation means ratepayers have found the implications for this future development extremely stressful. Difficult to digest the total effect of this proposed plan change 29 due to size and complexity. The population projections are questionable. Is the need there for such radical intensification in residential areas? Council staff have given little thought to the "future design of Nelson" as a whole. I have listened to some very thoughtful and qualified residents who are passionate about the future development of Nelson. I agree we need some intensificaiton and planning but this is too important to all of us to get it wrong.	Accept in part	Section 12
2824	S692.002	Helen Hoby	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Zone for residential areas.	The High Density Residential Zone is not in keeping with the low-rise housing we currently have. In the area we reside near to Fairfield Park, to have anything higher than 2 storey buildings on small sections would leave neighbouring residents with greatly depleted sunlight. The benefits of sunlight to everyday living is well known. The affect will be increased mental health concerns and depression. The possibility of high rise buildings so close to older residential housing, with boundary setbacks 1 metre would devalue properties, decrease privacy and increase anxiety. [It is] not appropriate to have 4-6 storey buildings in close proximity to single storey residents. Lack of sun and privacy will cause anxiety and increase mental health issues. Retired people choose to live in areas close to the city for the sun, to enjoy walking and gardening. We enjoy mixed ages with families in the neighbourhood.	Accept in part	Section 12

2825	S692.003	Helen Hoby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Create a Nelson Urban Design Plan including neighbourhood spatial plans prepared with citizen participation.	Need neighbourhood spatial plans. Each neighbourhood has its own character, therefore has specific design needs. To get good quality intensive design we need good planning and quality standards. Need citizen participation, that way the Council will get more public trust.	Reject	Section 13
2826	S692.004	Helen Hoby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Strengthen the current Urban Design Panel.	To ensure developers abide by the design plans and character of a neighbourhood.	Reject	Section 13
2827	S693.001	Peregrine Hoby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC 29 in its entirety [inferred].	I oppose the adoption of plan change 29 as a whole. The size and complexity of the proposed plan change 29 was such that it was beyond me to take in its total effect. Ratepayers, have been put into a state of stress, as to how the properties may be impacted as regards loss of sunlight and privacy and consequently loss of value!	Reject	Section 9
2828	S693.002	Peregrine Hoby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent hearing panel [inferred].	I oppose the appointment to the hearing panel of two councillors who oppose the withdrawal of PC 29.	Accept in part	Section 12
2829	S693.004	Peregrine Hoby	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the high density zone from the plan completely [inferred].	I strongly oppose the adoption of a High Density Residential Zone. Our property, a rear section, has properties on its North and East boundaries that lend themselves to development. Multi-story developments on these properties especially to 1m from boundaries would result in a total loss of sunlight until late in the day, and of privacy. This would result in a substantial loss of value, possibly to the extent of being unsellable!	Accept in part	Section 12
2830	S693.005	Peregrine Hoby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise intensification within the Inner City and City Fringe	Whilst I do not oppose the concept [of intensification] I do as to the proposal in PC 29. Planned intensification should begin with CBD and fringe areas. With regard to the latter, the area to the west of Rutherford Street, currently occupied by car yards is very suitable. Multi-story development would not, in most cases, impact adjoining properties to any extent.	Accept in part	Section 12
2831	S693.006	Peregrine Hoby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Explore the opportunity to create a satellite village [inferred].	Green Fields - further development on highly productive land is to be avoided. I believe a Satellite Village could be developed in the Hira area beyond Gentle Annie. Rolleston has been a great success for Christchurch and I understand a village is being developed out of Hamilton, which has attracted government support to the tune of $280 million.	Reject	Section 13
2832	S694.001	Glenys MacLellan	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	Include social housing in all zones.	"The market has never built housing the poor can afford". Social housing is desirable in all zones.	Reject	Section 13
2833	S694.009	Glenys MacLellan	Residential Zones	Amend	Require all new developments to have walking connections to public spaces.	Refer to reasons in submission point S694.002.	Reject	Section 12
2834	S695.001	Juan Torrenova	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Seeks council ensure the] Plan Change 29 rules be in line with the MBIE Transforming Operational Efficiency Framework requirements.	PC29 would need to consider the MBIE Transforming Operational Efficiency Framework to assess the impact of Daylight admission rules (among others). The Daylight admission rules applicable to a building project requires careful consideration (particularly in MRZ and HRZ residential zones) so the building's solar gains are maximised without reducing the thermal performance of surrounding buildings to the point of not compliance. [Refer to the document attached to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12
2835	S696.009	John Munting	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Use a portion of the tidal mud flats with allowance for rising sea levels or creating a mini Venice.	It's been considered decades ago, and rejected, but what about utilising a portion of the tidal mud flats with allowance for rising sea levels or creating a mini Venice here here!	Reject	Section 9
2836	S697.001	Philippa Vine	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Limited height of buildings and provisions for green spaces in centre of city.	It would change the look and scale of Central Nelson if such big buildings were to be put there.	Reject	Section 12
2837	S698.001	Margaret Muir	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw plan change 29 and begin afresh with proposals to increase housing density in Nelson.	I wish to voice my strong opposition to Plan change 29 and proposed changes to housing density and locations, specifically in existing residential areas.	Reject	Section 12

2838	S698.002	Margaret Muir	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Limit any high rise buildings to the Inner City centre or new currently undeveloped subdivisions outside of and not affecting existing residential areas.	The proposal to erect housing blocks up to 6 stories high in existing residential areas is poorly conceived and inherently flawed. This type of housing in areas such as Stoke and Nile Street, where most existing houses are single-story, would have a hugely detrimental effect on existing homeowners, and the surrounding area, affected by the tower blocks. Lost daylight, sunlight, outlook, not to mention the loss of value of those houses, plus extra noise generated by the tower blocks, would all take a toll on those already residing nearby. The infrastructure of existing residential areas is not designed or constructed to cope with the extra load generated by such high-density buildings. Roading, storm and wastewater systems would overload and cause further problems in the future. We already see the effects of overloading during storms when drains overflow and sewage is discharged into seas and estuaries. High-density housing is more appropriate in the inner-city Centre or in new, currently undeveloped subdivisions where infrastructure could be installed to suit such new building requirements and there is no impact on existing homeowners. Increasing housing density in the wider City Centre will encourage more people to live and work centrally. As well as integrating the City Centre, this will decrease commuting times and volume, thus having a positive ongoing effect on Climate Change mitigation.	Reject in part	Section 12
2839	S698.005	Margaret Muir	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Keep residents fully informed of any subsequent proposals by the Council, with a lengthy period for submissions and the right to voice any opposition, before any changes are accepted and put into place.	With regard to the decision request in submission point S698.001.	Reject	Section 13
2840	S699.002	James and Bridget Austin	Residential Zones	Amend	Treat the proposed Medium and High density zones the same.	Otherwise uptake will be too slow.	Reject	Section 12
2841	S700.001	Susan Hamilton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29.	I oppose the proposed plan change 29 in its entirety. Refer to reasons in submission point S700.002.	Reject	Section 9
2842	S700.002	Susan Hamilton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use a co-design process where Council engages with representatives of Nelson's communities with differing interests who are committed to working together collaboratively to develop a co-agreed plan that addresses the future intensification of Nelson. [Then] re-notify a revised Plan Change 29 that has been developed through the aboveprocess.	I understand that Council is not legally required as a Tier 2 Council to implement intensification and densification changes to its District Plan. I have found it difficult to digest PC 29's content and supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for me to read which personally makes this whole process challenging. I find the lack of pre-notification and Council's public engagement and consultation about PC29 unsatisfactory. Implies PC 29 has been prematurely put out within the legal RMA process for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so that the Council can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2843	S700.003	Susan Hamilton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Completion of a social assessment impact report that will inform PC29 and form part of the S32 Report analysis completed for PC29.	I believe that Plan Change 29 is not consistent with the objectives and policies which have over time led to the development of Nelson as I know it today, as a City with its unique and highly valued character, a place that current residents enjoy and future residents will value. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2844	S700.005	Susan Hamilton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appointment of a Hearings Panel of at least four and preferably five members with a quorum of three, and no more than one elected member. This aspect needs to be considered and reported to Council during the process prior to the Hearings commencement.	I strongly disagree with the make-up of the Hearings Panel. I am concerned with both the size and makeup of the appointed Hearings Panel. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

2845	S700.012	Susan Hamilton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Complete a Residential Spatial Plan that concentrates higher buildings in the Inner City and quickly reduces building heights as you radiate out from the Inner City.	Complete a Residential Spatial Plan that concentrates higher buildings in the Inner City and quickly reduces building heights as you radiate out from the Inner City. Generally align with the height limits that currently exist under the NRMP and enable growth in those areas through increased coverage or site specific allowed development. For this process consider using a Collaborative Process that involves representatives with diverse views e.g. Twyfords collaborative governance process (the Power of Co), that tests the aims and objectives of the proposed Plan Change, using independent urban designers with input from the community (not just those Planners, community focus groups and others previously involved in preparation of this Plan Change).	Accept in part	Section 13
2846	S700.013	Susan Hamilton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Form an Urban Design Panel to work with and assist developers create good quality design outcomes for the City.	Refer to reasons in submission point S700.010.	Reject	Section 13
2847	S700.014	Susan Hamilton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are much higher projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
2848	S700.015	Susan Hamilton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reconsider Proposed Plan Change 29 densification and intensification of the City and whether the Council (as a Tier 2 council) has a legal obligation to make this Plan Change 29 at this time.	Refer to reasons in submission point S700.002.	Reject	Section 12
2849	S700.016	Susan Hamilton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Plan and progressively phase in intensification for each area of the City to an agreed timeframe.	Take a progressively phased approach by firstly allowing intensification in the Inner City Centre and City Fringe areas (where 80 % of such development will occur) and allow increased two storey development on appropriate sized sites throughout the rest of the City. Opportunities for greater high rise development in the Residential Zone (greater than two storeys) could be introduced when these type of developments are known to be required. This would occur following more robust assessment to define specific areas for this type of development.	Reject	Section 10
2850	S700.018	Susan Hamilton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Include planning for development areas excluded from PC29.	Include planning for development in areas excluded from Plan Change 29 e.g. The Wood by enabling development to occur that considers and mitigates natural hazards and provides appropriate residential solutions to enable intensification and densification in these zones also. This development would support greater use of bus transport due to its close proximity to the Inner City and the relocated Bus Hub on the river.	Accept in part	Section 12
2851	FS28.161	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Include planning for development areas excluded from PC29. 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 in part	Section 12

2852	S700.020	Susan Hamilton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Require] Council work more 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 needy 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
2853	S700.022	Susan Hamilton	Infrastructure	Oppose	Plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	With properties' intensification the need for infrastructure capacity will increase. Planning for new infrastructure will be required in advance of building construction to avoid infrastructure issues currently experienced by some properties particularly during weather events e.g sewer overflows.	Reject	Section 11
2854	S700.023	Susan Hamilton	Infrastructure	Oppose	Plan to increase capacity requirements for our water, waste water and stormwater systems.	Refer to reasons in submission point S700.022.	Reject	Section 11
2855	S700.024	Susan Hamilton	Infrastructure	Oppose	Plan to increase roading capacity where required.	Refer to reasons in submission point S700.022.	Reject	Section 11
2856	S701.001	David MacDonald and Susan Hamilton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	The proposed plan change 29 is significantly different in nature from the existing Nelson Resource Management Plan (NRMP) and the changes are certainly far greater than 'less than minor'. Council is not legally required under the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act (the Act) as a Tier 2 Council, to implement intensification and densification changes to its District Plan (Nelson Resource Management Plan). 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. The probability of developments occurring that affect us personally is likely (based on the information provided by Council of a development occurring is 15% of the rezoned residential areas) but the consequence is major. We and the majority of other Nelson residents that we have spoken with confirm that they live in Nelson because of its unique character. That consists of a mix of heritage buildings, generally low rise (maximum 2 storeys) residential development, flora and fauna in abundance and access to sunshine in their homes throughout the year. Impacts on our property at 149 Tasman Street. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
2857	FS5.018	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 9
2858	FS78.306	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Lives in Nelson because of its unique character and mix of heritage buildings and low rise. Reject PC 29 in its entirety. 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 13

2859	FS65.342	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Lives in Nelson because of its unique character and mix of heritage buildings and low rise. Reject PC 29 in its entirety. 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 in part	Section 12
2860	S701.002	David MacDonald and Susan Hamilton	Entire Plan Change	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.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S701.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2861	S701.003	David MacDonald and Susan Hamilton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	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. The parameters for identifying such sites should be included in the NRMP.	Reject	Section 12
2862	S701.005	David MacDonald and Susan Hamilton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Complete a Residential Spatial Plan that concentrates higher buildings in the Inner City and quickly reduces building heights as you radiate out from the Inner City.	Generally align with the height limits that currently exist under the NRMP and enable growth of compliant development in those areas through increased coverage or site specific allowed higher development. For this process consider using a Collaborative Process that involves representatives with diverse views (e.g. Twyfords collaborative governance process "the Power of Co"), that tests the aims and objectives of the proposed Plan Change, using independent urban designers with input from the community (not just the Planners, community focus groups and others previously involved in preparation of this Plan Change 29).	Accept in part	Section 12
2863	S701.006	David MacDonald and Susan Hamilton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Introduce an Urban Design Panel.	To have some independence in this process an Urban Design Panel should be established that works with developers from the project initiation stage and throughout the process to achieve this outcome.	Reject	Section 13
2864	S701.007	David MacDonald and Susan Hamilton	Areas outside of the Plan Change	Oppose	Include planning for development in areas excluded from Plan Change 29 e.g. The Wood by enabling development to occur that considers and mitigates the effects ofknown natural hazards and provides appropriate residential solutions that enable intensification and densification in these zones.	This development would support greater use of bus transport due to its close proximity to the Inner City and the relocated Bus Hub at the river's edge.	Reject	Section 13

2865	FS28.145	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Include planning for development in areas excluded from Plan Change 29 e.g. The Wood by enabling development to occur that considers and mitigates the effects of known natural hazards and provides appropriate residential solutions that enable intensification and densification in these 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 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 in part	Section 12
2866	S701.008	David MacDonald and Susan Hamilton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Take a progressively phased approach by firstly allowing intensification in the Inner City Centre and City Fringe area (where 80% of such development will occur) and allow increased two storey development on appropriate sized sites throughout the rest of the city. Opportunities for greater high rise development in the Residential Zone (greater than two storeys) could be introduced when these type of developments are known to be required.	This would occur following more robust assessment to define specific areas and appropriate controls for this type of development. Refer also to the reasons in submission point S701.001.	Reject	Section 10
2867	S702.001	Mark Pattinson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject] plan change 29 and retain the current NRMP.	This submission is to oppose the proposed plan changes due to the negative effects this will have on existing properties. While I understand the Council's need for housing intensification, I believe this can be easily achieved within the existing regulations in specific areas.	Reject	Section 9
2868	S702.004	Mark Pattinson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise intensification within the inner city before changing existing residential neighbourhoods.	The inner city should be the starting point to have the most significant intensification, before considering any changes to the residential neighbourhoods.	Accept in part	Section 12

2869	S703.003	Mike Hawes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reconsider the changes around the need for resource consent, establish community design plans, determine minimum building design standards to ensure quality design outcomes in our residential areas as well as the city centre. Don't give developers open slather on developing high-rise monstrosities without local community input, and adopt a broader view on what the community wants living spaces to look like within the urban and central city environment.	I have major concerns about the lack of design standards and design vision for communities affected by the Plan Change. It is stated "For all new buildings in the commercial zones, a resource consent will be required. This will ensure quality design outcomes for new buildings in the city centre and suburban commercial areas." What about the urban/suburban residential areas outside the city centre? There doesn't appear to be consideration for quality design in these zones. Why would we be concerned about quality design in the city centre and commercial areas but not for residential high-rise development in suburban areas? New buildings in the city area would have much less visual impact and other effects amongst similar height/use buildings than high-rise apartments would in low-rise residential areas. In a residential area a new (ugly) building affects the tone of an area for the foreseeable future and surrounding houses are looking at it 24 hours a day whereas inner city areas are generally passed through by people and city buildings are constantly changing, i.e. citiscapes tend to be more dynamic and evolving. Betts Apartments at 4 storeys and the waterfront apartments at 4-6 storeys are good examples of what development could look like. On the other hand, Franklyn Village, which has to be one of the ugliest buildings in Nelson, at 5 storeys, is not what we as a city should be aspiring to build more of. I fear that if it is left up to the developers without the need for resource consent or agreed design standards in place then more of the Franklyn Village style design is what will eventuate. Why would developers of intensive accommodation (as opposed to high-end apartments), catering to a market that has fewer affordable options, opt for more expensive construction to make buildings look	Accept in part	Section 12
2870	S704.001	Mark Pattinson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject plan change 29 and retain the current NRMP [inferred]. Allow any future development under the existing regulations.	This submission is to oppose the proposed plan changes due to the negative effects this will have on existing properties. While we understand the Council's need for housing intensification, we believe this can be easily achieved within the existing regulations in specific areas.	Reject	Section 9
2871	S704.004	Mark Pattinson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise intensification within the inner city before changing existing residential neighbourhoods.	The inner city should be the starting point to have the most significant intensification, before considering any changes to the residential neighbourhoods.	Accept in part	Section 12
2872	S705.001	Caroline Vine	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose Plan Change 29.	[Plan Change 29] would be very detrimental as neighbours may lose their sun, view and privacy. There is not enough consultation taking place before plans are drawn up. Need to have input if beside your property. [Plan Change 29] would spoil the character of Nelson and perhaps create land instability how we have floods climate change with additional structures.	Reject	Section 13
2873	S706.001	Gwendolyn Struik (Bray) (Dr)	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject] Plan Change 29.	I object to and oppose Plan Change 29 (PC29) in its present form. These objections are based on some very readable submissions I have had access to and the excellent verbal statements I have heard at three PC29 public meetings. Navigating the Plan document Table of Contents or Index was beyond my technical ability. My submission is based on these two major sources of information - plus my own training in scientific research and writing for peer-reviewed and more popular journals. It appears to me that there has been a lack of sufficient thoughtful planning, in the first place, perhaps due to a lack of knowledge of Nelson/Whakatu history, followed by a process that left it to a few individuals (self-appointed, independent, i.e. volunteers) to sound the alarm and bring out public interest and expertise. It turns out the expertise is considerable and previously untapped.	Reject	Section 9

2874	S706.003	Gwendolyn Struik (Bray) (Dr)	Residential Zones	Not Stated	Locate residential development where there are sufficient community amenities within walking distance [inferred].	It seems to me that the function of planning is to build community. Any group of homes needs to have community amenities, such as a school, public hall, coffee shop, parks for recreation and sport, community garden and gathering space both indoor and outside - all within a reasonable walking distance. When there is an emergency, such as a flood or human tragedy, and where some or all normal power, water, food are lacking we all look to neighbours and community, i.e. people to help. In Aotearoa, we are fortunate that we have a model in the indigenous people who build community around a common space - the Marae. I note that often when there is a disaster, people in the area gather and live in a local Marae or school, or public place. These public spaces are essential. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
2875	S706.004	Gwendolyn Struik (Bray) (Dr)	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Consider] basic essentials for human well-being: breathable air, drinkable water, healthy food from healthy soil, appropriate exercise, community amenity and contact with nature.	It seems to me that one of the bases of good planning is to provide for human well-being. Basic essentials for human well-being are: breathable air, drinkable water, healthy food from healthy soil, appropriate exercise, community amenity and contact with nature. The latter two are especially important for mental health and need to be part of any urban planning. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
2876	S706.006	Gwendolyn Struik (Bray) (Dr)	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider more permeable options for streets, car parks and footpaths [inferred]	With climate change, it is necessary to plan for heavy rainfall events so permeability of as many surfaces as possible is necessary. The obvious place to start is when streets, car parks and footpaths are re-paved. This is not cheap, but will save gazillions in reduced flood and slip damage.	Reject	Section 13
2877	S706.007	Gwendolyn Struik (Bray) (Dr)	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Encourage use of water tanks on houses or in communities.	Water tanks on houses or in communities of houses would also reduce overloaded waterways in times of excess rainfall. This also helps build resilience of neighbourhoods in times of stress.	Reject	Section 11
2878	S707.002	June Laird	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Delay the changes to allow for] more time to understand the new resource management legislation (including the Natural and Built Environment Act, Spatial Planning Act and proposed National Planning Framework), as well as what changes the incoming Government may propose to that legislation.	I am also aware that new resource management legislation has recently been enacted, that sets a new structure for planning in New Zealand, and it may be some time before the impacts of that new legislation are fully understood (including any impacts on that legislation coming out of the change in Government).	Reject	Section 13
2879	S708.001	Harry Pearson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S708.002.	Reject	Section 13
2880	S708.002	Harry Pearson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. Council planning staff have stated at numerous meeting "this is a Broad Bush approach" that has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that required the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can redesign it. Despite numerous requests, NCC has refused to contact by email or letter, all its ratepayers. Over 19 submissions were lodged opposing the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy (NTFDS) proposal that areas in Tahunanui be zoned suitable for 6 storey buildings. We have often been told at public meetings on PC29 held by NCC that PC29 is based on the NTFDS and the submissions received on that. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

2881	FS61.039	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Slope instability - There has been no consideration of geotechnical issues when deciding on the proposed zoning of the areas, Our biggest concern is that high density development ill increase the severity of future slips on the Tahunanui Hills. The proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills is in an area potentially affected by the significant natural hazard of slope instability. PC29 Housing and Hazards on the NCC website stated that intensification should not include areas potentially affected by significant natural hazards. Amenities - The NCC planning team stated that the Tahunanui Hills were chosen for the proposed high density development because of the closeness to amenities. The amenities referred to (being the school and shops) are down a steep set of stairs and across State Highway 1, not easily assessable for young families, elderly of the mobility impaired without a vehicle. There are no supermarkets within walking distance of the proposed HDZ in Tahunanui which would be a serious issue for all the HDZ residents with no vehicles. Traffic - The Tahunanui Hills is serviced by narrow winding streets which in our opinion are inappropriate to serve high volumes of traffic Sunlight is an essential part of living in Nelson and why we chose to live on Tahunanui 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 neighboring intensification with the following possible effects: All 5 edges of our property could have 6 storey high apartments one metre from the boundary. Hill properties like ours already have additional shading issues directly	Reject	Section 9
2882	FS72.038	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support. It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Slope instability - There has been no consideration of geotechnical issues when deciding on the proposed zoning of the areas, Our biggest concern is that high density development ill increase the severity of future slips on the Tahunanui Hills. The proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills is in an area potentially affected by the significant natural hazard of slope instability. PC29 Housing and Hazards on the NCC website stated that intensification should not include areas potentially affected by significant natural hazards. Amenities - The NCC planning team stated that the Tahunanui Hills were chosen for the proposed high density development because of the closeness to amenities. The amenities referred to (being the school and shops) are down a steep set of stairs and across State Highway 1, not easily assessable for young families, elderly of the mobility impaired without a vehicle. There are no supermarkets within walking distance of the proposed HDZ in Tahunanui which would be a serious issue for all the HDZ residents with no vehicles. Traffic - The Tahunanui Hills is serviced by narrow winding streets which in our opinion are inappropriate to serve high volumes of traffic Sunlight is an essential part of living in Nelson and why we chose to live on Tahunanui 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 neighboring intensification with the following possible effects: All 5 edges of our property could have 6 storey high apartments one metre from the boundary. Hill properties like ours already have additional shading issues directly	Reject	Section 11

2883	FS60.030	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Slope instability - There has been no consideration of geotechnical issues when deciding on the proposed zoning of the areas, Our biggest concern is that high density development ill increase the severity of future slips on the Tahunanui Hills. The proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills is in an area potentially affected by the significant natural hazard of slope instability. PC29 Housing and Hazards on the NCC website stated that intensification should not include areas potentially affected by significant natural hazards. Amenities - The NCC planning team stated that the Tahunanui Hills were chosen for the proposed high density development because of the closeness to amenities. The amenities referred to (being the school and shops) are down a steep set of stairs and across State Highway 1, not easily assessable for young families, elderly of the mobility impaired without a vehicle. There are no supermarkets within walking distance of the proposed HDZ in Tahunanui which would be a serious issue for all the HDZ residents with no vehicles. Traffic - The Tahunanui Hills is serviced by narrow winding streets which in our opinion are inappropriate to serve high volumes of traffic Sunlight is an essential part of living in Nelson and why we chose to live on Tahunanui 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 neighboring intensification with the following possible effects: All 5 edges of our property could have 6 storey high apartments one metre from the boundary. Hill properties like ours already have additional shading issues directly	Reject	Section 9
2884	S708.003	Harry Pearson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent hearing panel (no current Councillors) to hear the submissions, and if that is not possible, appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, and if that is not possible, add two well qualified people who are not current Councillors to the Hearing Panel (for example, a demographer or a professional member of Nelson Tasman 2050).	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2885	S708.004	Harry Pearson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ. [Refer to the original submission for more detail.]	Reject	Section 10
2886	S708.006	Harry Pearson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S708.005.	Reject	Section 13
2887	S708.010	Harry Pearson	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
2888	S708.011	Harry Pearson	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 12

2889	FS28.048	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 in part	Section 12
2890	S708.013	Harry Pearson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
2891	S708.018	Harry Pearson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S708.005 and S708.011.	Reject	Section 13
2892	S708.019	Harry Pearson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2893	S708.027	Harry Pearson	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. The impacts on mental health of living in multistorey buildings providing social housing needs to be considered prior to multistorey social housing developments being given consent, as studies have found that multistorey buildings can have a detrimental effect on residents mental health. [Refer to link in original submission].	Reject	Section 13
2894	S708.029	Harry Pearson	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	If council does not or is unwilling to provide the infrastructure required to allow for intensification, and instead stipulates that this must be paid for by developers, then the opportunities for development and intensification will not be equitable. This is because only large developer, social housing providers, and government organizations like Kainga Ora will be able to meet this extra cost. Other rate payers will generally not be able to afford such a surcharge and therefore will not be able to develop their properties to help meet the need for intensification.	Reject	Section 11
2895	S708.030	Harry Pearson	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	[Refer to reasons in submission point S708.029].	Reject	Section 11

2896	S708.031	Harry Pearson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Council identify and assess the social impact of PC29 and identify strategies that might mitigate any potential effects associated with proposed Plan Change 29 on peoples wellbeing and Nelson society in general.	[Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2897	S708.032	Harry Pearson	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Seeks council] consider advice from Nelson Tasman2050 which is an independent think tank of built environment professionals sketching pathways towards a better future.	Our mission is to help create vibrant communities though advocating, promoting, and supporting our transition to resilient, sustainable, affordable equitable and community focused urban environments through quality intensification.	Reject	Section 13
2898	S708.035	Harry Pearson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] that Council identify and assess the social impact of PC29 and identifies strategies that might mitigated any potential effects on well-being and Nelson society in general.	The section 32 evaluation report is inadequate. This report does not fully consider the risk and impact to people's health, lifestyle and property value if a multi-storey building, especially over two storeys, is built next to them.	Reject	Section 13
2899	S708.037	Harry Pearson	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Seeks] council identify and assess the social impact of PC29 and identify the strategies that might mitigate any potential effects associated with proposed PC29 on peoples' wellbeing and Nelsons society in general.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2900	S708.040	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the proposed Tahunanui High Density Zone.	Slope instability - There has been no consideration of geotechnical issues when deciding on the proposed zoning of the areas, Our biggest concern is that high density development ill increase the severity of future slips on the Tahunanui Hills. The proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills is in an area potentially affected by the significant natural hazard of slope instability. PC29 Housing and Hazards on the NCC website stated that intensification should not include areas potentially affected by significant natural hazards. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
2901	FS72.039	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support. It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Slope instability - There has been no consideration of geotechnical issues when deciding on the proposed zoning of the areas, Our biggest concern is that high density development ill increase the severity of future slips on the Tahunanui Hills. The proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills is in an area potentially affected by the significant natural hazard of slope instability. PC29 Housing and Hazards on the NCC website stated that intensification should not include areas potentially affected by significant natural hazards. Amenities - The NCC planning team stated that the Tahunanui Hills were chosen for the proposed high density development because of the closeness to amenities. The amenities referred to (being the school and shops) are down a steep set of stairs and across State Highway 1, not easily assessable for young families, elderly of the mobility impaired without a vehicle. There are no supermarkets within walking distance of the proposed HDZ in Tahunanui which would be a serious issue for all the HDZ residents with no vehicles. Traffic - The Tahunanui Hills is serviced by narrow winding streets which in our opinion are inappropriate to serve high volumes of traffic Sunlight is an essential part of living in Nelson and why we chose to live on Tahunanui 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 neighboring intensification with the following possible effects: All 5 edges of our property could have 6 storey high apartments one metre from the boundary. Hill properties like ours already have additional shading issues directly	Reject	Section 11

2902	FS60.031	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	he Particular Part of the submission I support: It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Slope instability - There has been no consideration of geotechnical issues when deciding on the proposed zoning of the areas, Our biggest concern is that high density development ill increase the severity of future slips on the Tahunanui Hills. The proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills is in an area potentially affected by the significant natural hazard of slope instability. PC29 Housing and Hazards on the NCC website stated that intensification should not include areas potentially affected by significant natural hazards. Amenities - The NCC planning team stated that the Tahunanui Hills were chosen for the proposed high density development because of the closeness to amenities. The amenities referred to (being the school and shops) are down a steep set of stairs and across State Highway 1, not easily assessable for young families, elderly of the mobility impaired without a vehicle. There are no supermarkets within walking distance of the proposed HDZ in Tahunanui which would be a serious issue for all the HDZ residents with no vehicles. Traffic - The Tahunanui Hills is serviced by narrow winding streets which in our opinion are inappropriate to serve high volumes of traffic Sunlight is an essential part of living in Nelson and why we chose to live on Tahunanui 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 neighboring intensification with the following possible effects: All 5 edges of our property could have 6 storey high apartments one metre from the boundary. Hill properties like ours already have additional shading issues directly	Accept	Section 11
2903	S708.041	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the proposed Tahunanui High Density Zone.	Amenities - The NCC planning team stated that the Tahunanui Hills were chosen for the proposed high density development because of the closeness to amenities. The amenities referred to (being the school and shops) are down a steep set of stairs and across State Highway 1, not easily assessable for young families, elderly of the mobility impaired without a vehicle. There are no supermarkets within walking distance of the proposed HDZ in Tahunanui which would be a serious issue for all the HDZ residents with no vehicles.	Accept	Section 12

2904	FS72.040	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support. It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Slope instability - There has been no consideration of geotechnical issues when deciding on the proposed zoning of the areas, Our biggest concern is that high density development ill increase the severity of future slips on the Tahunanui Hills. The proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills is in an area potentially affected by the significant natural hazard of slope instability. PC29 Housing and Hazards on the NCC website stated that intensification should not include areas potentially affected by significant natural hazards. Amenities - The NCC planning team stated that the Tahunanui Hills were chosen for the proposed high density development because of the closeness to amenities. The amenities referred to (being the school and shops) are down a steep set of stairs and across State Highway 1, not easily assessable for young families, elderly of the mobility impaired without a vehicle. There are no supermarkets within walking distance of the proposed HDZ in Tahunanui which would be a serious issue for all the HDZ residents with no vehicles. Traffic - The Tahunanui Hills is serviced by narrow winding streets which in our opinion are inappropriate to serve high volumes of traffic Sunlight is an essential part of living in Nelson and why we chose to live on Tahunanui 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 neighboring intensification with the following possible effects: All 5 edges of our property could have 6 storey high apartments one metre from the boundary. Hill properties like ours already have additional shading issues directly	Reject	Section 11
2905	FS60.032	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Slope instability - There has been no consideration of geotechnical issues when deciding on the proposed zoning of the areas, Our biggest concern is that high density development ill increase the severity of future slips on the Tahunanui Hills. The proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills is in an area potentially affected by the significant natural hazard of slope instability. PC29 Housing and Hazards on the NCC website stated that intensification should not include areas potentially affected by significant natural hazards. Amenities - The NCC planning team stated that the Tahunanui Hills were chosen for the proposed high density development because of the closeness to amenities. The amenities referred to (being the school and shops) are down a steep set of stairs and across State Highway 1, not easily assessable for young families, elderly of the mobility impaired without a vehicle. There are no supermarkets within walking distance of the proposed HDZ in Tahunanui which would be a serious issue for all the HDZ residents with no vehicles. Traffic - The Tahunanui Hills is serviced by narrow winding streets which in our opinion are inappropriate to serve high volumes of traffic Sunlight is an essential part of living in Nelson and why we chose to live on Tahunanui 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 neighboring intensification with the following possible effects: All 5 edges of our property could have 6 storey high apartments one metre from the boundary. Hill properties like ours already have additional shading issues directly	Reject	Section 9

2906	S708.043	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the proposed Tahunanui High Density Zone.	Sunlight is an essential part of living in Nelson and why we chose to live on Tahunanui 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 neighboring intensification with the following possible effects: All 5 edges of our property could have 6 storey high apartments one metre from the boundary. Hill properties like ours already have additional shading issues directly from the hill the lack of sunlight could result in existing homes becoming dark and damp with associated mold and mildew. The value of our house is likely to decrease. Privacy and outlook are a critical part of enjoying our property and we would lose both of these if apartments were built next to us.	Accept	Section 12
2907	FS72.042	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support. It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Slope instability - There has been no consideration of geotechnical issues when deciding on the proposed zoning of the areas, Our biggest concern is that high density development ill increase the severity of future slips on the Tahunanui Hills. The proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills is in an area potentially affected by the significant natural hazard of slope instability. PC29 Housing and Hazards on the NCC website stated that intensification should not include areas potentially affected by significant natural hazards. Amenities - The NCC planning team stated that the Tahunanui Hills were chosen for the proposed high density development because of the closeness to amenities. The amenities referred to (being the school and shops) are down a steep set of stairs and across State Highway 1, not easily assessable for young families, elderly of the mobility impaired without a vehicle. There are no supermarkets within walking distance of the proposed HDZ in Tahunanui which would be a serious issue for all the HDZ residents with no vehicles. Traffic - The Tahunanui Hills is serviced by narrow winding streets which in our opinion are inappropriate to serve high volumes of traffic Sunlight is an essential part of living in Nelson and why we chose to live on Tahunanui 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 neighboring intensification with the following possible effects: All 5 edges of our property could have 6 storey high apartments one metre from the boundary. Hill properties like ours already have additional shading issues directly	Reject	Section 11

2908	FS60.034	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	he Particular Part of the submission I support: It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Slope instability - There has been no consideration of geotechnical issues when deciding on the proposed zoning of the areas, Our biggest concern is that high density development ill increase the severity of future slips on the Tahunanui Hills. The proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills is in an area potentially affected by the significant natural hazard of slope instability. PC29 Housing and Hazards on the NCC website stated that intensification should not include areas potentially affected by significant natural hazards. Amenities - The NCC planning team stated that the Tahunanui Hills were chosen for the proposed high density development because of the closeness to amenities. The amenities referred to (being the school and shops) are down a steep set of stairs and across State Highway 1, not easily assessable for young families, elderly of the mobility impaired without a vehicle. There are no supermarkets within walking distance of the proposed HDZ in Tahunanui which would be a serious issue for all the HDZ residents with no vehicles. Traffic - The Tahunanui Hills is serviced by narrow winding streets which in our opinion are inappropriate to serve high volumes of traffic Sunlight is an essential part of living in Nelson and why we chose to live on Tahunanui 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 neighboring intensification with the following possible effects: All 5 edges of our property could have 6 storey high apartments one metre from the boundary. Hill properties like ours already have additional shading issues directly	Accept in part	Section 12
2909	S708.044	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the proposed Tahunanui High Density Zone.	There are many established large trees (over 6m high) in this Tahunanui Hill HDZ that are helping stabilize the ground and providing a habitat for our native birds. These will be lost when there is no sun to support their growth or removed to make way for intensive development. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
2910	S708.045	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Oppose the proposed Tahunanui High Density Zone.	Tamaki Street is one of the steepest streets in New Zealand and it has over 400 steps at the top to Princes Drive. Many walkers, runner, tourists and locals walk daily from the bottom of Tamaki Street up the hill for fitness, well being and to enjoy the peaceful beautiful view down the hill to the sea. WE estimate around 100 walkers a day walk up and down Tamaki Street, They enjoy the established gardens and birdlife. This walking trail would lose some of its amenity value and views, whilst also becoming more shaded and dangerous with the increase in traffic from any intersection.	Accept	Section 12
2911	S708.046	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the proposed Tahunanui High Density Zone.	It will be expensive for developers to fulfil the requirements to build 6 storey buildings on the hill. The resulting apartments therefore would be fewer in number and expensive to buy. The Tahunanui HDZ could easily become developments of expensive holiday apartments that simply sit empty for long periods. This does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. Such developments can only be achieved by large development companies or government agencies and are at the expense of other residents who cannot afford to compete with the height and size of the neighboring developments.	Accept in part	Section 12

2912	S709.051	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Consider the use of the Urban Design Panel, including:	The Urban Design panel is as a tool to achieve positive design outcomes that benefit public health. Advice from experienced designers is required to create a well-functioning urban environment that meets the needs of, and contributes to, the wellbeing of current and future generations. Whilst we support panel experts who are adept in urban design and architecture (including landscape architecture), we suggest other expertise to strengthen the panel. On top of this, the Panel could facilitate a coordinated multi-disciplinary approach to support design outcomes that meet the needs of the whole community. See DO13A.6.2. It is understood that the panel's recommendations will be non-statutory, but they will be an important benchmark for the assessment of resource consent applications. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2913	S709.064	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Undertake a social impact assessment (SIA) to understand the implications of 6 storey development on the health and wellbeing of current and future generations; prior to enabling 6 storeys within this plan [in any zone].	Recommend a SIA to support the best long- term outcomes for the community's health and wellbeing. While it can be reviewed what has happened elsewhere, it is important not to use examples from overseas without direct consideration of the local context. Without having certainty of supportive infrastructure based on an understanding of specific geographic contexts and community needs, this way of living could pose significant health risks. Refer to submission point S709.063 and the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 13
2914	S709.082	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend the assessment criteria for rules REr.18P and REr.18Q [Restaurants and Dairies] to add as follows: REr.18P.4 a... b... c...d.the effect of the activity on public health and wellbeing. [and make consequential amendments to REr.19P and REr.19Q to match].	Support in part REr.18P.4 Support minimising the adverse effects on residential amenity values, including noise and lighting. It is important to consider the wider effect of the activity on public health and wellbeing. Restaurants and Dairies can be known to sell alcohol, cigarettes, vapes, and ultra-processed foods. Unhealthy diets, high BMI, tobacco, and alcohol contribute about one-third of the overall preventable health loss in New Zealand. The choices that people make when consuming food and drink are heavily influenced by what options they are exposed to. [Refer to the original detail for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2915	S709.136	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Amend the Open Space and Recreation Zone rule OSr.24.1 as follows: b. Any activity located more than 50m from the Residential Zone boundary, which involves the sale of liquor for consumption on the premises, may be open for the sale of liquor only during the following hours: Daily: 7am 8am - 3am the following day, and	Amend to comply with default maximum national trading hours Section 43 Sale and Supply of Alcohol Act.	Reject	Section 9
2916	S709.137	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Amend the Open Space and Recreation Zone rule OSr.27.1 Service buildings as follows: Service buildings to be used for changing rooms, ablutions, toilets or storage for sports or reserve maintenance equipment are permitted if: a...b. they are built to be usable and accessible for disabled people.c. cycle parking is provided. d.mobility parking is provided.	Provisions for service buildings such as toilets need to be strengthened to ensure designs are accessible. Including Cycle Parking as seen in other aspects of this plan change would provide consistency in wording and improve connectivity within cycle networks. This also aligns to NCCs Active Travel Strategy - Facilities at destinations which encourage active travel, such as secure and covered cycle parking and showering and changing facilities. And this will help achieve the community outcome in NCCs Active Travel Strategy: A connected and integrated active travel network, linked to public transport, enables many in our community to more easily access the full range of social, educational and recreational facilities and activities.	Accept	Section 9

2917	S709.138	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Add to Open Space and Recreation Zone rule OSr.30.4 Playgrounds assessment criteria as follows:c.the connectivity to active travel networks and the provision of cycle parking.d.the accessibility of the structure for disabled people.	As per S709.137 and in addition the NCC Active Travel Strategy states: Connected active travel networks enable all socio-economic groups, ages and abilities to reach facilities and activities.	Reject	Section 11
2918	S709.139	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Add to OSr.38.4 Light spill Assessment Criteria as follows: b. the extent to which additional light may adversely affect occupation of residential properties such as sleep disturbance.f. The extent to which additional light may adversely affect the environment and wildlife.	Refer to reasons in submission point S709.133.	Accept	Section 9
2919	S710.001	Jenny Bennett and Aaron Thompson	Entire Plan Change	Support	PC29 is fully supported.	136 St Vincent Street, Nelson [is a] large residential site (1692m2) is ideally suited to accommodate some of the residential growth that is anticipated in the coming decades. This part of the City is also close to schools, recreational amenity, cycleways, commercial and employment opportunities that provide for an ideal location for higher density living. The topography also provides the opportunity for high density without impacting significantly on other properties. In the context of this site and the wider valley, PC29 is therefore fully supported.	Accept in part	Section 12
2920	S711.001	Ian Goss	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Consider effects of the Plan Change proposal on the community and individual residents as well as to fulfil the requirements of the RMA.	The solution proposed does not consider effects on the community (social or economic), and existing property owners in particular. Costs related to reduced property values would fall on individual property owners by way of loss of privacy, loss of sunlight, and reduced saleability. When asked if there was any analysis of the cost a property owner would be exposed to in terms of capital loss if they have the misfortune to be adjacent to an intensification site, planning staff said this was not required under the RMA. Given that the Planning team is effectively employed by the community it has an obligation to have on hand and provide this information. The presented "How Plan Change 29 could affect you" makes no attempt to clearly identify these effects, nor the fact that the random nature of development encouraged means that no-one is excluded from this exposure. Property owners have paid rates and taxes but will become exposed to individual capital loss through no fault of their own and imposed by the acts of their own elected council. NCC is encouraging people to submit on PC29 but have neglected to provide any information or breakdown of these effects. Claims that PC29 will provide access to the housing market environment for young people and new market entrants are misleading. New market entrants are likely to be restricted by circumstances to properties which have some degree of hazard designation or are in areas where they are more likely to be exposed to nearby intensification with related potential loss of value. Either of these issues can result in problems with maintaining insurance, or maintaining a property value that justifies mortgage collateral requirements. How is it intended to require and support affordable housing with the new developments?	Reject	Section 13
2921	S711.002	Ian Goss	Natural Hazards/Climate Change	Oppose in part	Review and assess the recently established hazard information in relation to identifying areas appropriate (or specifically inappropriate) for intensification and establish a range of preliminary preferences including options for ensuring adequate infrastructure.	Proposed PC29 proposes to combine recent hazard review results over the city area with the proposed intensification option, with no attempt to integrate the two components. A lot has been spent by council on hazard reviews and analysis - why has NCC not used this information along with their knowledge of the city's built development including infrastructure capacities, to identify areas most appropriate for intensification. This would allow for targeted planning processes and an approach befitting a Smart little city.	Reject	Section 11

2922	S711.003	Ian Goss	Natural Hazards/Climate Change	Oppose in part	Engage professional urban design specialists to consider and develop options for these areas [identified using the process outlined in submission point S711.002] with consideration of issues related to land ownership, infrastructure capacity and durability, access to services etc.	The platitudes rolled out in response to questions about the infrastructure capacities to accommodate intensification need to be revisited. Piecemeal development makes increasing capacity of the likes of wastewater and stormwater networks difficult, especially when there is no guide to where demand may be added. It is easy to say that developers' contributions will be used to solve these problems, but it is unlikely that they will be adequate to provide adequate solutions with incremental increases to the performance of aging conveyance, treatment, and pumping systems.	Reject	Section 13
2923	S711.004	Ian Goss	Natural Hazards/Climate Change	Oppose in part	Include proper consideration of climate change effects on the hazards already identified and the potential need for retreat from flooding, land stability issues, and sea level rise effects.	Issues such as climate change and sea level rise have not been given appropriate consideration. Managed retreat from various hazards and unexpected outcomes from climate change acceleration could affect the nature and magnitude of the hazards identified and influence the requirements for intensification.	Reject	Section 13
2924	S711.005	Ian Goss	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Develop a plan and strategy for the implementation of intensification of some of the areas identified as suitable, including community engagement, and consideration of options for obtaining the land to do so. Include analysis and information to the community on the effects on their environment, and potentially personal impacts.	PC29 as presented is described (by council staff) as allowing for "piecemeal" development. It relies on the abandonment a number of the principles of the current plan requirements which have been developed incrementally over a number of decades to provide a reliable framework that is acceptable and workable for the community. The proposed PC29 replacement is expected to provide intensification in a haphazard and unpredictable manner without a proper consultation process, without regard for the victims of collateral costs, and with no apparent options for correction if actual development observed has undesirable outcomes. This is contrary to the concept of a formal plan which should have a clear and stated objective with a defined pathway parameters that can be monitored and corrected as changes advance. The chaotic development distribution expected is unlikely to result in the establishment of desirable living spaces, and hardly qualifies as a plan. There do not appear to be any corrective measures available to refocus, with development rates and directions in the hands of developers.	Reject	Section 13
2925	S711.006	Ian Goss	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Consider how the costs of intensification will be imposed, and whether these will be supported by Central Government or local rates.	The Central Government push to accommodate an increased population needs to be viewed in perspective. Recent information (Sep 23) from the Department of Statistics shows that of the country's overall population increase in the last year about 85% (86,000 people) is from immigration. There are clearly benefits to the country from this change but at a Central Government level. Why should individual property owners in Nelson be expected to become exposed to capital losses arising from the effects PC29 as explained above? Has there been any consideration of funding these losses from Government contributions or rates?	Reject	Section 11
2926	S711.007	Ian Goss	Natural Hazards/Climate Change	Oppose in part	Review options for improvement/upgrading of hazard prone areas, including vacation and remediation of reasonable areas.	Refer to reasons in submission points S711.002, S711.003 and S711.004.	Reject	Section 13
2927	S711.008	Ian Goss	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Following ongoing community consultation and nominal acceptance propose a "no surprises" plan change, while ensuring that a fair and accountable process is followed through the plan development and hearings.	It is understood the Plan Change has been initiated as part of a required review, and also in response to a Central Government requirement to consider the accommodation of near-term population growth. The outcome is a proposed PC29 that focuses on the population issue and presents one option intended to achieve this. I accept that intensification is the likely requirement to achieve this result but the solution advanced to achieve this is unstructured and unmanaged development. What other options were considered and why were they not presented and consulted on before PC29 was publicly notified?	Reject	Section 9

2928	S711.009	Ian Goss	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose the plan change as presented in its entirety.	I oppose the Plan Change as presented in its entirety. The scale of PC29 is such that it is impractical to submit on a provision-by-provision basis and it is unreasonable to expect this given the volume of material included. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
2929	S711.010	Ian Goss	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Clarify the operative status of the plan change with regards to the ePlan format and request for submisions [inferred].	1. The proposed Plan Change is very wide ranging and is presented as an EPlan which may be appropriate for plan implementation but has the effect of obscuring issues from reviewers and makes specific provisions interlinked with others. This is unhelpful in terms of responding and the EPlan presentation is premature for the consultation phase and has clearly taken considerable effort to compile. It also give the impression that PC29 as presented is considered fait accompli which is apparently not so?? Council comments and requests for input suggest that the process is presently in a consultation phase rather than the lead up to a hearing. Why has the status not been properly clarified?	Reject	Section 13
2930	S712.001	Nicholas Fisher and Tammy Pegg	Entire Plan Change	Support	PC29 is fully supported.	31 Tipahi Street, Nelson South [is a] large residential site (1163m2) is ideally suited to accommodate some of the residential growth that is anticipated in the coming decades. This part of the City is also close to schools, commercial services, the Hospital and recreational opportunities that provide for an ideal location for higher density living. In the context of this site and the wider area, PC29 is therefore fully supported.	Accept	Section 9
2931	S713.004	Cherilyn Barber	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, especially in the suburbs outside of the central city of Nelson. Refer to reasons in submission point S713.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
2932	S713.006	Cherilyn Barber	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City and new developments, and not in current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S713.001 and S713.004 above. Keep intensification in the central city and to new developments, away from the already established suburbs. This would have less of an impact on the everyday lives of people already living there, and would make the city centre more vibrant. People in the inner city developments would be living closer to all the services, restaurants, movie theatres, and shops. They would also have better access to the public transport systems. This would bring much needed life back to the city centre, and residents could walk and bike to where they need to go more easily, for work, recreation, and shopping.	Accept in part	Section 12
2933	S713.007	Cherilyn Barber	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
2934	S713.008	Cherilyn Barber	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
2935	S713.014	Cherilyn Barber	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Build another community outside of Nelson city, similar to Pegasus in North Canterbury.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 12
2936	S714.001	Dorothy Siebet	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S714.002.	Reject	Section 13
2937	S714.002	Dorothy Siebet	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

2938	S714.003	Dorothy Siebet	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
2939	S714.004	Dorothy Siebet	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
2940	S714.006	Dorothy Siebet	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S714.005.	Reject	Section 13
2941	S714.010	Dorothy Siebet	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
2942	S714.011	Dorothy Siebet	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 12
2943	FS28.049	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 in part	Section 12
2944	S714.013	Dorothy Siebet	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
2945	S714.018	Dorothy Siebet	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S714.005 and S714.011.	Reject	Section 13
2946	S714.019	Dorothy Siebet	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10

2947	S714.027	Dorothy Siebet	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
2948	S714.029	Dorothy Siebet	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2949	S714.030	Dorothy Siebet	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2950	S715.001	Susan Ware	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S715.002.	Reject	Section 13
2951	S715.002	Susan Ware	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
2952	S715.003	Susan Ware	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
2953	S715.004	Susan Ware	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
2954	S715.006	Susan Ware	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S715.005.	Reject	Section 13
2955	S715.010	Susan Ware	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
2956	S715.011	Susan Ware	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 12

2957	FS28.050	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 in part	Section 12
2958	S715.013	Susan Ware	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
2959	S715.018	Susan Ware	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S715.005 and S715.011.	Reject	Section 13
2960	S715.019	Susan Ware	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2961	S715.027	Susan Ware	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
2962	S715.029	Susan Ware	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2963	S715.030	Susan Ware	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2964	S715.039	Susan Ware	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request] a robust, long-term design process for housing density placement rather than the infill-where-ever possible current scenario.	Refer to reasons in submission point S715.027.	Reject	Section 13
2965	S717.001	Cynthia Martin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	I reject the notified plan change 29.	Reject	Section 9

2966	FS31.007	Stephen Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2967	FS72.007	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. This plan is out of step with the NZ Central Government's proposed plans for development. The NZ Government has indicated a lack of support for the previous Government's position on densification. Until more direction is given, this has the potential to be a waste of Council and Ratepayers' funds and time following an outdated Central Government brief. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 9
2968	FS66.009	Carol Webster		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2969	FS61.007	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2970	FS76.007	Robert Stevenson(1)		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2971	FS54.007	Nicole Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13

2972	FS53.007	Susan Gibson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2973	FS46.007	Dan McGuire		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2974	FS77.007	Harry Pearson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2975	FS58.007	Robert Stevenson		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2976	FS60.007	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support: Reject PC29 in its entirety. Insufficient public engagement on PC29. Insufficient time to digest, understand and submit on such a large plan change. Flawed demographic population forecasts. No neighbourhood plans, as per the FDS. Lack of published information on the negative adverse effects on property owners. To remove the overwhelming stress on residents who have limited time and ability to decipher the potential undisclosed negative effects on their lives.	Reject	Section 13
2977	S717.002	Cynthia Martin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	The Council to first consider housing intensification within the city before implementing the current change in zoning.	The creation of a High Density Residential Zone [HDZ] proposing a maximum height greater than 12m in this area which has not been previously mandated. The lack of protection it facilitates for sunllight to adjacent properties: a critical element in all urban residential amenities - enabling energy efficiency, warmth and wellbeing. Infrastructure elements absent from the plan.	Reject	Section 10
2978	S717.006	Cynthia Martin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S717.001 and S717.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
2979	S719.001	The Domett St/Hardy St/ Tasman St/ Nile St block	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 9

2980	S719.004	The Domett St/Hardy St/ Tasman St/ Nile St block	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request that] Council to use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
2981	S719.005	The Domett St/Hardy St/ Tasman St/ Nile St block	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Protect residential neighbourhoods by ensuring that new developments are] thoughtfully designed and planned on a neighbourhood, by neighbourhood basis to maintain the essence of their character.	Nelson is a very special and unique place that needs to be protected with care. It is unlike any other district in NZ. It includes a 'Low Rise' City with a collection of heritage and non-heritage character buildings that have attracted people for generations and been a cherished holiday destination for many New Zealanders. Contemporary Black Iron Clad Boxes, built only a few metres from 120-year-old Historic Hornes is a thoughtless lack of long-term vision for maintaining the attraction of Nelson for all the future residents and visitors. Green Spaces, Trees and Landscaping are essential for the look and feel of some of our older neighbourhoods. They help considerably with the wellbeing of the residents and help to provide an essential part of the attraction of Nelson, which must all be considered during developing the growth of Nelson. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
2982	FS47.002	Wainui Properties Limited		Oppose	Reject in part	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: neighbourhood planning. The submitter seeks "thoughtfully designed and planned" developments which is supported. However, the "neighbourhood by neighbourhood" relief sought would create significant inefficiency and so be counterproductive to the intensification objectives of PC29.	Reject	Section 13
2983	FS78.038	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Protect residential neighbourhoods. Neighbourhood spatial plans have not been prepared in consultation with residents. 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).	Reject	Section 12
2984	FS65.346	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Protect residential neighbourhoods. 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. 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 in part	Section 12
2985	S719.009	The Domett St/Hardy St/ Tasman St/ Nile St block	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
2986	FS47.003	Wainui Properties Limited		Oppose	Reject in part	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Removal of the High Density Zone. It is considered that the land at 137-155 Wainui Street contains many of the attributes necessary for a High-Density Development to be successful. This is one of the last remaining large sites available in the City to accommodate intensification.	Accept in part	Section 12
2987	S719.010	The Domett St/Hardy St/ Tasman St/ Nile St block	Mapping	Oppose	Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district.	Refer to reasons in submission point S719.009.	Reject	Section 12

2988	FS28.051	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 in part	Section 12
2989	S719.016	The Domett St/Hardy St/ Tasman St/ Nile St block	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
2990	S720.001	Mary Gavin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw Plan Change 29.	Key reasons are summarised as follows: - Public agitation: It is very insensitive to inflame insecurity and entrenched factionalism in the city at this time. - Risk: Tinkering with compromises developed from the submission process poses an unacceptable risk that the good features of PC29 will be rejected because they are bundled with adverse outcomes - Proven flaws: Professional expertise shared at public meetings by demographic, architectural, planning and heritage sectors have identified serious flaws in the information informing and underpinning some key decisions in the Plan. - Irresponsible spending for an interim response: It is clear that this response to housing shortages and unaffordability is inadequate to meet the stated aims and is a waste of resources. - Political ambivalence: Plan Change 29 does not have unanimous support from the elected Councillors as evidenced by the tightly contested Council vote on 14 September 2023 on the motion to withdraw Plan Change 29, and instead consult on it as a draft. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
2991	FS83.151	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
2992	S720.002	Mary Gavin	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose regulations in the High Density Residential zone.	Refer to reasons in submission point S720.001.	Accept	Section 12
2993	FS83.152	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
2994	S720.004	Mary Gavin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Review the demographic data that Plan Change 29 relies on.	Despite the provisions outlined in RE2i and RE2.3, the social engineering inherent in unchallenged generalised statements about potential advantages is dangerous e.g Encouraging people to live close to commercial centres, amenities and places of employment, can reduce demands on energy use for commuting and a reliance on private vehicles for transport. PC29 appears to have ignored the recent research results from the excellent Housing We'd Choose study conducted by m.e consulting in 2021 to help inform the NPS-UD. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
2995	FS83.154	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
2996	S721.001	Belinda Roselli	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	I understand we must prepare for increased number of residents making the NCC rated area, as their future homes. What an opportunity this is to "get it right" for future residents, however, without fully discussing with existing residents I reject PC 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
2997	S721.002	Belinda Roselli	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors from either side of the Sept 14th vote [to the hearing panel].	The 2 Councillors appointed presumably have the qualifications, but they have both voted FOR PC29. Balance is key.	Reject	Section 13
2998	S721.003	Belinda Roselli	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 10

2999	S721.005	Belinda Roselli	Mapping	Oppose	Remove HDRZ from the plan completely.	Increased intensification will result in more on-street car parking and the narrow streets of Nelson will become a hazard to pedestrians, mobility scooters, cyclists, refuse collection and Emergency Service vehicles. This will cause fracturing of neighbourly relations and 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	Sectrion 12
3000	S721.006	Belinda Roselli	Mapping	Oppose	Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district on the introduction of PC29.	Refer to reasons in submission point S721.005.	Reject	Section 12
3001	FS28.052	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 in part	Section 12
3002	S722.001	Mary Ayre	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose the plan change in its current form.	This is on the basis of: - Loss of sunlight - Loss of individual character in houses/ gardens - Loss of green spaces in the inner city - Increased pressure on street parking - Nelson not being a tier 1 city - Permanent destruction of Nelsons' heritage character and attractiveness. From a gardeners point of view our city's individuality, ecological, health and beauty are inextricably linked to its gardens... This must be taken into account with any proposed changes. Poised as we are on an environmental tipping point it is incomprehensible to me that the council is proposing accelerating this process by enabling the filling of green space with buildings, blocking sunlight and replacing old established plantings with new formulaic ones... Our garden has been a place of vitality, beauty and connections for others, blocking the sunlight with high buildings would destroy it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
3003	FS78.313	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Oppose plan change in current form including: permanent destruction of Nelsons' heritage character and attractiveness. 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 13
3004	FS65.352	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Oppose plan change in current form including: permanent destruction of Nelsons' heritage character and attractiveness. 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 in part	Section 12
3005	S722.002	Mary Ayre	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Resist the temptation to adopt a tier 1 designation.	Refer to reasons in submission point S722.001.	Reject	Section 8

3006	S722.004	Mary Ayre	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Give more attention to the existing dwellings.	Give more attention to the existing dwellings. Are they generally occupied or for example solely used as holiday rentals? Are they a significant element in the character/ conditions of the existing neighbourhood? Are their gardens part of the character of the area?	Reject	Section 9
3007	S722.005	Mary Ayre	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Consider weather events, natural disasters, pandemic and political crisis.	Give more consideration to the effects of very hot dry summers, high winds, torrential rain on an over-built neighbourhood and potential lockdowns. Particularily the state of emergency scenario whether it is natural disaster, pandemic or political crisis.	Reject	Section 13
3008	S722.006	Mary Ayre	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Give more consideration to the long term legacy of lax planning.	Compare high rises in Newtown Wellington with the carefully planned new estates in Christchurch for example.	Reject	Section 13
3009	S723.001	Yvonne Thompson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan 29 in its entirety.	I would like Nelson City Council to reject Plan 29 in its entirety as it stands. It needs better data and a better plan for broader satisfaction. High rise of 3-6 storeys would fracture existing well-established older residential areas. Communities that are cohesive and neighbourly would be seriously impacted. The effects of blocking skyline and light could result in colder shaded properties possibly sandwiched between 2-6 storey blocks. This would affect solar panels and vegetable gardens, both of which have been encouraged to be installed. Also, the resulting sunlight will cause more depression and mental illness. It seems there would be little or no comfort over what and where a high-rise can be built, no avenue for input. It would be costly for both parties if a dispute arises. Council should have more controls and oversite in place. I am in favour of the inner-city spaces that already exist being used for high rise provided it doesn't affect well-established surrounding residential buildings. An urban planning organised approach is needed rather than the 'blunt instrument' presented. It is too important to leave to developers. As the owner of an 1860ish heritage-listed cottage, I have had many passer-by's commenting on this 'our street and also the atmosphere and picturesque nature of Nelson's older residential areas. This is what makes our city special. Why ruin it with Plan 29 as it stands. High rise of 3-6 storeys would fracture existing well-established older residential areas. Communities that are cohesive and neighbourly would be seriously impacted.	Accept in part	Section 9
3010	S725.001	Stephen Mace	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Rejet PC29 in its entirety.	I totally oppose plan change 29. There are many negative effects with Plan Change 29 such as: Daylight angles Parking issues Noise issues Issues around the lack of infrastructure in relation to intensification Destruction of the existing character of our city Residents views and outlooks. Plan change 29 seems to me to be panic planning that will result in a huge loss of character to what is currently a beautiful city and and awesome place to live.	Reject	Section 9
3011	S725.002	Stephen Mace	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Housing intensification should only be in site specific locations under existing rules.	A degree of housing intensification in site specific locations has been happening in central Nelson for some time and much of that with what seems to be very low impact. This should be allowed to continue. This should only be in site specific locations under existing rules never wholesale zones as Plan Change 29 advocates.	Reject	Section 12
3012	S726.004	John Bullock	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 S726.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3013	S726.006	John Bullock	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S726.001 and S726.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12

3014	S726.011	John Bullock	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S726.009 and S726.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3015	S726.013	John Bullock	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Review Japan's example of affordable housing in compact low-carbon neighbourhoods. Have a civic debate and bring in urban planners, landscape [designers], and residents to properly consider all aspects of how land is currently used.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3016	S727.004	Nicola Hawes	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 S727.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3017	S727.006	Nicola Hawes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S727.001 and S727.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3018	S727.011	Nicola Hawes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S727.009 and S727.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3019	S727.012	Nicola Hawes	Heritage	Oppose	Consider high value, low rise, spaced out housing estates beyond Atawhai.	The impact to residents and character areas of the city will be significant. More big box housing is unattractive as was big box retailing.	Accept in part	Section 12
3020	S727.014	Nicola Hawes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Provide international evidence on sustainable eco villages.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3021	S728.001	Linda Mace	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request that Council take] a more detailed look at affordable housing options. For example, Queen Street Holiday Park in Richmond is providing long term affordable accommodation for people.	A main reason given for higher density is for more affordable houses. Multiple storey building are not cheap to build. Would they really provide more affordable housing?	Reject	Section 13
3022	FS28.147	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: [Request that Council take] a more detailed look at affordable housing options. For example, Queen Street Holiday Park in Richmond is providing long term affordable accommodation for people. There are a number of areas that are not appropriate or compatible with further residential intensification or long-term affordable accommodation, in particular those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays e.g. Tahunanui Camping Ground.	Accept in part	Section 12
3023	S728.003	Linda Mace	Infrastructure	Oppose	[Request that Council identify] how they will provide space in schools for all school age children living in high density areas.	Schools in the area are already at capacity so where would any new students moving into higher density area go for the schooling.	Reject	Section 11

3024	S728.006	Linda Mace	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Identify suitable spaces that would suit higher density with limited impact on existing residents. For example, lower St Vincent Street opposite the commercial businesses.	I don't disagree that housing is expensive and multi-storey complexes can be a way of providing more accommodation. Multi-storey complexes like the Quest apartments on Collingwood St, the new builds on Halifax St and Haven Rd, are built in places where residential accommodation may not otherwise be built. Their impact on surrounding houses is limited or non-existent. Surely we have other such spaces that could fit the model of higher density, with limited impact on the existing residents. Christchurch rebuild has seen more housing built on sections that typically would have once had just one property. These new builds are being built in such a way that off street parking, areas of privacy, and daylight hours have all been taken into consideration and provided for. Being built at the same time they compliment each other rather than imposing on existing builds.	Reject	Section 12
3025	S729.001	Ian Wishart	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change C29 as it currently stands.	I support the general idea of intensification to reduce car emissions and urban sprawl. However, I find the proposal put forth in PC29 will have too many foreseeable and unintended consequences to be acceptable in its current form. I have a general concern that the planned intensification of Nelson is being rushed without prior spatial planning and design considerations. In particular, I have three particular concerns: 1. no consideration has been given to reductio in the property values of adjacent and nearby homes and property. 2. lack of consideration for allowing tall buildings to obstruct the views of nearby homes. 3. concerned that both permitted and discretionary/non-complying activities are allowed to proceed without reference to the views of those living nearby. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
3026	S729.002	Ian Wishart	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose six storey buildings anywhere outside of the CBD.	I oppose the idea of allowing random construction of high buildings without prior spatial planning and full community consultation on options around where high and dense development might be appropriate. We need extended and open design considerations that can a maximize aesthetics and sustainability and maximise oppositional activity from other residents adjacent and nearby. PC29 has had no such discussion around design considerations and despite some consultation around the FDS there has been no discussion about how to design lovely 2-4 buildings and integrated living neighbourhoods.	Accept in part	Section 12
3027	S729.003	Ian Wishart	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Amend the Regional Policy Statement to have bottom lines around housing capacity and price derived from the HBA.	The RPS currently does not have these bottom lines.	Reject	Section 9
3028	S729.004	Ian Wishart	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Plan Change 29 to contain an analysis of how it affects the price of housing.	It does not. The price of two storey apartments buildings in Nelson currently are well into the 700k range even though they are just henhouse type slums. See section 3.2 of the NPSUD.	Reject	Section 12
3029	S729.006	Ian Wishart	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider intensification and height issues on a spatially planned basis with full input from the community on location and design issues.	Refer to reasons in submission points S729.001 and S729.002.	Accept in part	Section 12
3030	S730.001	Stephanie Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons on submission point 002 .	Reject	Section 13

3031	S730.002	Stephanie Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 13
3032	S730.003	Stephanie Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3033	S730.004	Stephanie Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
3034	S730.006	Stephanie Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point 004.	Reject	Section 13
3035	S730.010	Stephanie Gray	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Accept	Section 12
3036	S730.011	Stephanie Gray	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 12
3037	FS28.053	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 in part	Section 12
3038	S730.013	Stephanie Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. Eg Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3039	S730.018	Stephanie Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point 004.	Reject	Section 13

3040	S730.019	Stephanie Gray	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 10
3041	S730.027	Stephanie Gray	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
3042	S732.001	John Fitchett	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Request that the Council resolves under Schedule 1 Clause 8D Resource Management Act to withdraw the Plan Change 29. If this submission points fails, refer to submission points S732.002 - S732.052.	There has not been compliance with the statutory prerequisites for a Plan Change (and processing the same) in that - such consultation as it undertook (in addition to Section 3 (1) RMA) was not done in accordance with section 82 Local Government Act; and - the purported extension of time for Submissions to 31 October was unauthorised. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
3043	FS83.160	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 9
3044	S732.003	Tim Morrison	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules.	Progressively Phased Intensification a) Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. b) City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. I ask Council to negotiate and/or incentivize appropriate indusial and commercial premises to relocate to less essential land that can be better used for accommodation. I ask Council to consider intensification of industrial and commercial land in fringe city zones, thus freeing up land for residential purposes. c) Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). I would support Medium Density Residential Zones (3 Storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, providing existing Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Reject	Section 10
3044	S732.003	John Fitchett	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose the repeated use of the expression "planned built" and "planned built character", and the use of those three words together generally; and request that amendments are made to the relevant chapters reflect this opposition. [In addition, opposition is noted to specific uses of the words 'planned built character' as follows:]	I interpret [the deletion of Policy RE1.2c which provided that it was necessary that any residential development "does not diminish the amenity of neighbouring sites"; and the repeated use of planned built character of a zone] as meaning that on a consideration of any Resource Consent application the Council Planner commences with the premise that anything (for example in the HDZ) which does not exceed a height of 12 metres at the boundary and 19.5 metres at the top of a recession plane (and complies with all the other Rules), is acceptable without question or enquiry. [I oppose] the theory that the existing "character" of an area, and the prospective loss of amenity by neighbours (and the neighbourhood) is to be treated as subservient to the entitlements set out in the proposal [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12

3045	FS83.162	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 9
3046	S732.004	John Fitchett	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose the theory that the existing "character" of an area, and the prospective loss of amenity by neighbours (and the neighbourhood) is to be treated as subservient to the entitlements set out in the proposal; and request that amendments are made to the relevant chapters reflect this opposition. [In addition, opposition is noted to specific changes to references to amenity related provisions as follows]:	Refer to reasons in submission point S732.003.	Reject	Section 10
3047	FS83.163	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 9
3048	S732.005	John Fitchett	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose the statements that there is a "housing crisis": as set out in the proposal, and theSection 32 Report, and in various written comments from Council Planning staff.	I do not accept as true many of the statements made by the Mayor and Councillors in support of the Plan Change. Some of such statements are: ... that Nelson's population will increase by nearly 12,000 (6,470 households) by 2051, even though such figures are open to serious dispute. That the data apparently used by Council to substantiate its suggestion that population will increase dramatically is factually wrong... Council has failed (and refused) to rely on populations numbers as published by Statistics New Zealand and/or other reputable sources... that the basic premise for the proposal (i.e that Nelson population is increasing and likely to increase to the extent detailed in the proposal and its supporting papers) is false, and the demography supporting such premise is wrong; and was known by Council Officers to be wrong at the date of Notification (10 August 2023)... [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3049	FS83.164	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 9
3050	S732.006	John Fitchett	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose that part of the proposal that creates a High Density Zone [HDZ}, and request that the HDZ portion of the proposal be deleted entirely, with the area shown as HDZ be changed to Medium Density Residential Zone.	I Oppose that part of the proposal that creates a High Density Zone; and as grounds/reasons I rely on all the grounds set out below: That (if implemented) the proposal will affect me, and the amenities I currently enjoy, personally and negatively, in that: - My neighbours to the immediate west, north west, north, and east would be entitled as of right) to build to 12 metres and 19.5 metres generally to the boundaries of my property: thereby detrimentally affecting the view and ambience of my property or blocking sunlight or daylight from my property [abridged]. - if any of those four neighbours built apartments, the value of the property occupied by me would fall substantially. - the possible building of several 6 storey blocks of residential apartments in the HDZ will change (to the detriment of all residents) the character of Nelson. - THE REASONS/GROUNDS for all parts of my Opposition include all grounds detailed by other Submitters opposing those aspects of the proposal that I have opposed. AND the references (in the proposal and Section 32 Report) to the FDS are misleading, and can be seen to have been intentionally misleading... there has been no decision/resolution by Council ("in committee" or in "open" meeting) authorising Council staff to prepare a draft Plan Change which included any suggestion of permitting (as of right) buildings of 6 storeys in any residential area... [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12

3051	FS83.165	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 9
3052	S732.046	John Fitchett	Mapping	Oppose	[Change the area] shownas Medium Density Zone in the proposal be changedto General Density Zone; and [undertake] wholesalere-drafting of Objectives and Policies to reflect the said changes and the rationale forthem.	Refer to reasons in submission point S732.006.	Accept in part	Section 12
3053	FS83.207	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 9
3054	S732.048	John Fitchett	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Request that Council appoints an independent Panel (i.e. not including any present Councillor) to hear the Submissions.	The Deputy Mayor and Councillor Brand should have disqualified themselves from voting on the formal Notification (of 10 August), and have already showed pre- determination in respect of the proposal. The Deputy Mayor has been reported in Nelson Mail as saying that the proposal is ''lust testing the idea" - which shows he misunderstands the statutory relevance of the proposal. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3055	FS83.209	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 9
3056	S732.049	John Fitchett	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Amend the plan to reflect that I do not accept as true that Council will work with developers to sequence preferred locations for growth and acknowledge that the installed infrastructure is currently insufficient to cater for the planned intensification, and that Council would have little control over where/when development took place.	I do not accept as true that Council will work with developers to sequence preferred locations for growth: i.e. an implied acknowledgement that the installed infrastructure is currently insufficient to cater for the planned intensification, and that Council would have little control over where/when development took place.	Reject	Section 9
3057	FS83.210	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 9
3058	S733.004	Allan Barber	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, especially in the suburbs outside of the central city of Nelson. Refer to reasons in submission point S733.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3059	S733.006	Allan Barber	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City and new developments, and not in current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S733.001 and S733.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3060	S733.007	Allan Barber	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3061	S733.008	Allan Barber	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3062	S733.009	Allan Barber	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seek to intensify through smaller section sizes].	With just five million people (a population the size of Melbourne), the citizens of our towns and small cities currently enjoy a lifestyle relatively free of objectionable multi-storied buildings that shade streets and other smaller residential buildings. This plan change is so radical and I believe completely unnecessary for a city with just 54,000 residents. By allowing Plan Change 29 to proceed, the character of our city will be compromised. A mismatch of multi-storey buildings can only detract from the aesthetic values that Nelson residents enjoy. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9

3063	S733.013	Allan Barber	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Allow] this plan change to apply only to new subdivisions.	Then anyone buying within the new subdivision will know what to expect in terms of allowable building types.	Reject	Section 9
3064	S733.014	Allan Barber	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Restrict multi-storey buildings] to CBD areas where multi-storey buildings are already present.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 12
3065	S733.015	Allan Barber	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Build another community outside of Nelson city like Pegasus in North Canterbury.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 12
3066	S733.016	Allan Barber	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Revise plan change 29 to be more acceptable to Nelson residents].	There are many Nelson residents that feel very strongly about this issue and should your decision be to run with the plan change as currently proposed, [there will] be many angry residents disillusioned with the council and council processes.	Reject	Section 9
3067	S734.001	Hugh Griffin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw PC29 and appoint a suitable qualified group to prepare an intensification plan change, with public consultation as an integral part of preparing a new plan.	That PC29 is not a suitable solution to the future population growth of a city that is the size and character of Nelson. I would ask for Council to withdraw PC29 and appoint a suitable qualified group to consult on and prepare an intensification plan change that is more suited to a provincial city of Nelson's size, character and aspirations. I suggest it would be an advantage to have a consensual plan change. To achieve this more regard would need to be given to a more tailored intensification plan that would respond more sympathetically to the unique character and topography of the city. Public consultation should be an integral part of the development of any new intensification plan change.	Reject	Section 9
3068	FS83.214	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
3069	S735.001	Ulf and Eva Kerer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC 29 in its entirety.	I reject PC 29 in its entirety. I want to acknowledge: That I have found it difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. That I have found PC 29 lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council, with its severe implications towards the well-being of existing rate paying residents enjoyment of their properties, extremely stressful, very time consuming and unnecessary. That Council Planning Staff have stated at numerous meetings "This is a 'Broad Brush approach' that requires public submissions to refine the plan". Such a statement implies PC29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions.	Reject	Section 9
3070	S735.002	Ulf and Eva Kerer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote and if that is not followed then all Councillors are to be replaced with independent Commissioners.	I strongly disagree with the make-up of the hearing panel, because of its 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3071	S735.003	Ulf and Eva Kerer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3072	S735.005	Ulf and Eva Kerer	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely [inferred].	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12

3073	S735.009	Ulf and Eva Kerer	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
3074	S735.013	Ulf and Eva Kerer	Infrastructure	Oppose	Any high-intensification plan should incorporate infrastructure improvements to minimize adverse impacts on the neighbourhood and the environment.	Aging Infrastructure: In many neighbourhoods with predominantly single-level one-family houses, the existing infrastructure, such as water supply, sewage systems, and electrical grids, is designed to accommodate a lower population density. Introducing high-intensity development without concurrent infrastructure upgrades will place significant strain on these systems. Service Disruptions: An inadequately upgraded infrastructure will lead to service disruptions and outages, affecting not only the new developments but also the existing residents. Cost Burden: The cost of infrastructure upgrades to support high-intensity development is borne by local governments or existing residents through increased rates or fees. This will create financial burdens for those who may not have directly benefited from the development. [Refer to original submission for more detail.]	Accept in part	Section 11
3075	S735.014	Ulf and Eva Kerer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Any high-intensification plan should incorporate sustainable practices to minimize adverse impacts on the neighbourhood and the environment.	Green Space Reduction: High-intensification plans may require the removal of green spaces and trees to accommodate new construction. This reduction in greenery can have several adverse environmental effects, including: Increased urban heat island effect, which raises temperatures in the neighbourhood. Diminished air quality due to fewer trees to absorb pollutants and provide oxygen. Loss of habitat for local wildlife, potentially disrupting the ecosystem.	Reject	Section 13
3076	S735.016	Ulf and Eva Kerer	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Invest in comprehensive urban planning to create a brighter more sustainable future for all of us.	I also want to emphasize the critical importance of proactively planning urban development rather than leaving it solely to private developers to build as they see fit. Comprehensive, community-focused planning is essential to ensure the long-term well-being, sustainability, and the harmonious growth of our neighbourhoods and cities. The role of comprehensive urban planning [supports]: Balanced and inclusive growth Preservation of community character Infrastructure and public services Environmental sustainability Environmental protection Mitigating urban sprawl Community involvement Transparency and community input Economic and social equity Affordable housing Job creation Sustainable long-term vision. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 13
3077	S736.001	David Ryan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29 in its entirety.	The council should reject the Plan Change 29 outright. They should start again and adopt a plan that is appropriate for such a a small country town like Nelson, and not reflect the values of larger NZ cities.	Reject	Section 9
3078	S736.002	David Ryan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Establish a combined Nelson/Tasman Urban Development Agency with serious urban planners involved.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3079	S737.004	Mark Christieson	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 S737.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3080	S737.006	Mark Christieson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S737.001 and S737.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12

3081	S737.007	Mark Christieson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3082	S737.008	Mark Christieson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3083	S737.010	Mark Christieson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seek to] grow and [develop] more higher density villages out in the country on less productive land with better transport options to the cities.	Not stated.	Accept in part	Section 12
3084	S738.001	Sali Matthews	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S738.002.	Reject	Section 13
3085	S738.002	Sali Matthews	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3086	S738.003	Sali Matthews	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3087	S738.004	Sali Matthews	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
3088	S738.006	Sali Matthews	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S738.005.	Reject	Section 13
3089	S738.010	Sali Matthews	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3090	S738.011	Sali Matthews	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 12
3091	FS28.054	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 in part	Section 12

3092	S738.019	Sali Matthews	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3093	S738.027	Sali Matthews	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
3094	S738.029	Sali Matthews	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3095	S738.030	Sali Matthews	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3096	S738.031	Sali Matthews	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose] Plan Change 29.	As a ratepayer and a long-term resident of Nelson, I feel very stressed and upset that our elected officials have presented such a huge plan change, with minimal consultation and requiring such a short period to consider and provide submissions. It is deeply upsetting, especially considering all else going on in our families, community, New Zealand and the world, which we have to deal with. Nelson is very livable and full of vitality, this is partially due to new residents bringing their ideas, culture and personalities to Nelson. It is important to cater for this population increase while retaining the character of Nelson. To simply use a blunt tool and broad-brush approach to urban development will destroy the inherent character of Nelson. Nelson is an amazing city. However, it appears that the Council has not implemented a carefully thought-out strategy for necessary future development to keep it an amazing city. I welcome further development, and population growth - however careful planning is required to keep the Vibe and feel of Nelson. Urban development needs to be managed carefully. Plan 29 does not do this. Nelson does not need buildings with 6 stories to cater for population growth, it needs a carefully planned strategy. I have read and agree with the submission from NelsonTasman2050, and their proposal for a joint Nelson-Tasman Urban Development agency. My Ultimate concern is that the Council seems to consider that sunlight in houses is an unnecessary luxury in the growth of Nelson. I vehemently disagree with this concept, as do most people in Nelson. Sunshine is critical to mental, physical and emotional health. It is clearly noted in the Housing Demand Preferences report commissioned by Nelson Tasman that "sunny" was ranked as the	Reject	Section 12
3097	FS5.16	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 9
3098	S739.001	Jo Kinross	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29 in its totality and start again with a new plan that reflects the special character of Nelson.	That Council reject Plan Change 29 outright and to start again with a new plan that reflects the special character of Nelson. A plan that is appropriate for a small coastal town, not a major city.	Reject	Section 9

3099	FS83.215	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with their points and this submission discusses an urban development agency, this is the correct way to move forward.	Reject	Section 12
3100	S739.002	Jo Kinross	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Establish a combined Nelson-Tasman Urban Development Agency as outlined by Nelson Tasman 2050 Document.	Refer to Nelson Tasman 2050 Document attached to original submission.	Reject	Section 13
3101	FS83.216	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with their points and this submission discusses an urban development agency, this is the correct way to move forward.	Reject	Section 12
3102	S740.004	Janet Southwick	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 S740.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3103	S740.006	Janet Southwick	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S740.001 and S740.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3104	S740.007	Janet Southwick	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[I seek] that Council reconsider their choice and appoint 1 councillor from either side of the Sept. 14 vote.	I strongly disagree with the makeup of the hearing panel because of its 'biased' public perception after watching and listening to the vote on Councillors Courtney's proposed withdrawal of PC29 at the Sept. 14 Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3105	S740.012	Janet Southwick	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	I ask that Council withdraw PC29 and get Council Planning to refine the plan and then put it out for public submissions.	At the public meetings that I have attended Council Planning Staff have stated "this is a broad brush approach" that requires public submissions to refine the plan". When directly ask what I thought to be a simple question, I was told to "make a submission". This statement implies PC29 has been prematurely put out for public submission in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety so they can redesign it.	Reject	Section 10
3106	S740.018	Janet Southwick	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seek that] all along the Maitai was to be a reserve and the streetscape would not change.	It seems for some reason that the most easily accessible walkway and cycleway could not end up in a cement jungle. This would cause a loss of green space and disrupt local ecosystems and reduce the riverside parks aesthetic and recreational value. There could also be an increase in stormwater runoff and can lead to erosion, water pollution, and altered hydrology. See original submission for further detail.	Reject	Section 11
3107	S740.020	Janet Southwick	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Council needs to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high quality housing choices.	I would ask that Council does not 'hand over' our neighbourhoods to property developers who only care about the bottom line.	Reject	Section 10
3108	S740.023	Janet Southwick	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject plan change 29, but if it is not rejected, then make the changes as set out in the submission.	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3109	S741.004	David Gibson	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 S741.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3110	S741.006	David Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S741.001 and S741.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3111	S741.007	David Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Both Nelson City Councillors' on this review panel are openly in support of Plan Change 29 proceeding with multi-storey dwellings being placed in current residential areas. This renders the panel compromised in relation to impartiality. This has been raised at public meetings with the Mayor refusing to change the make-up of the panel.	Reject	Section 13
3112	S741.008	David Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13

3113	S741.009	David Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29 in its entirety].	Although I do not object to intensification in the inner city to a level not exceeding four levels, I do object to the Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 in its entirety [for the reasons listed in submission points S741.007 and S741.010 to S741.017.	Reject	Section 9
3114	S741.012	David Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Focus intensification to the inner city and revisit expansion to the city fringes and residential zones in [the] future as required. [Utilised evidence based projections].	Flawed data - the Nelson City Council have predicted a population growth that is in direct contrast to that predicted by Statistics New Zealand which is the recognised Government agency required to provide projections. Therefore, the city is intensifying to a higher level than required. The projection should be evidence based and not subject to 'guess work'.	Accept in part	Section 12
3115	S742.004	David Worthington	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 S742.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3116	S742.006	David Worthington	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S742.001 and S742.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3117	S742.012	David Worthington	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S742.000 and S742.011 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3118	S743.004	Ana Reyes	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 S743.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3119	S743.006	Ana Reyes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S743.001 and S743.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3120	S743.011	Ana Reyes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S743.009 and S743.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3121	S744.004	Judith Dix	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 S744.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3122	S744.006	Judith Dix	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S744.001 and S744.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3123	S744.011	Judith Dix	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S744.009 and S744.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3124	S744.013	Judith Dix	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Make sure that the projected population growth for Nelson is a real crisis.	Restricted land area and the constraints of available work will naturally restrict growth. In 20 years as the baby-boomers move on, there may well be an oversupply of housing.	Reject	Section 10
3125	S745.004	Rosemarie Manktelow	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 S744.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3126	S745.006	Rosemarie Manktelow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S745.001 and S745.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12

3127	S745.011	Rosemarie Manktelow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S745.009 and S745.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3128	S746.004	Melissa Short	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 S746.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3129	S746.006	Melissa Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S746.001 and S746.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3130	S746.011	Melissa Short	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S746.009 and S746.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3131	S747.001	Camilla Randall-Eldstrom	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29 [and replace] with a new plan which reflects the special character of Nelson.	It is paramount that the Council rejects Plan Change 29 outright, with a new plan which reflects the special character of Nelson. A plan that is appropriate for a small coastal town!	Reject	Section 9
3132	FS78.322	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Reject Plan Change 29 [and replace] with a new plan which reflects the special character of 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 12
3133	FS65.361	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Reject Plan Change 29 [and replace] with a new plan which reflects the special character of Nelson. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
3134	S748.001	David Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons on submission point 002 .	Reject	Section 13
3135	S748.002	David Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 13
3136	S748.003	David Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3137	S748.004	David Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10

3138	S748.006	David Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point 004.	Reject	Section 13
3139	S748.010	David Smith	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Accept	Section 12
3140	S748.011	David Smith	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 12
3141	FS28.055	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 in part	Section 12
3142	S748.013	David Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. Eg Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3143	S748.018	David Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point 004.	Reject	Section 13
3144	S748.019	David Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 10
3145	S748.027	David Smith	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
3146	S749.001	Dennis Goodman	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	[Intensification] should not be done on a block-by-block basis. It almost has to be done on a section-by-section, or group of sections, basis.	I support the changes in principle, however it's too simplistic in its current form.	Reject	Section 9

3147	S750.001	Julie Carter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC 29 in its entirety.	There seems to be a lack of a cohesive roll-out of Plan Change 29 - raising awareness in the community, consultation with residents, and the availability of documentation so that people understand the proposed changes, that may directly affect them.	Reject	Section 9
3148	FS5.022	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 9
3149	S750.003	Julie Carter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Replace panel Councillors with independent commissioners.	I disagree with the make-up of the hearing panel, due to the conflict of interest. Both Councillors on the panel have already voted in favour of Plan Change 29 following the vote on Councillor Courtney's proposal to withdraw PC29 on the 14th of September. With this very clear conflict of interest these Councillors should be replaced with independent commissioners.	Reject	Section 13
3150	S750.004	Julie Carter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Utilise the highest scientific standards to develop accurate population projections [inferred].	In his submission for Plan Change 29, Dr Geoffrey Hayes states that 'The analysis of past and projected population growth in Nelson undertaken by NCC is seriously flawed'. As the Council have already said, 'Plan Change 29 is the biggest plan change that we have done as a Council in a generation'. (Our Nelson, Issue 176. P6). Surely this means that we should be informed of the correct information and not something that is seriously flawed. Why has the Council not adhered to the highest scientific standards, when significant changes will affect our city and our lives? Clearly, overstating our population increase and inflating the need for Plan Change 29 will impact the planning, decision making and extra housing to be built. Exaggerated and flawed projections are not good enough in this context.	Reject	Section 10
3151	S750.006	Julie Carter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Utilise experts in urban design, landscape architects, and architects to ensure good design outcomes [inferred].	In his Stuff article published on the 23rd of October, Timo Neubauer (an Urban Designer) asks 'Can we intensify Nelson without a design?' Without a design for our city, what will be the future look and feel of our town? It is not acceptable that NCC has missed the design stage altogether to allow any building development without much in the way of criteria. Our Future Development Strategy outlines the need for open spaces, outlook, privacy, private green spaces, and play areas already. We need a shared vision for Nelson, not a Council vision. Well-designed towns and cities that are great to live in don't happen by chance. Plan Change 29 also facilitates the loss of non-renewable heritage resources with economic, social, and environmental consequences. In addition, do we also need the expertise of urban designers, landscape architects and architects to avoid an unplanned, poorly designed outcome? Is there a plan in our climate crisis environment for flood protection and water courses amongst this proposed intensification?	Accept in part	Section 12

3152	S750.007	Julie Carter	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the HDRZ from the plan completely [inferred].	I strongly oppose the High-Density Residential Zone as it is not in keeping with Nelson's character, single storey dwellings, views, and outlooks. The ad-hoc planning of Kainga Ora builds in many suburbs at a maximum height of 19.5 m seems aesthetically illiterate because of the impacts on existing residents. The NCC has created a win-lose scenario, where some people get housing, but existing residents get shade, decreased property value, and an absence of protection. We have added a sunroom to 59 Wellington Street with tiles on the floor and glass walls, so that the sun can enter and be absorbed by the tiles. It is a delightful space to be in. But by building tower blocks next to us, this sunroom will no longer exist. It is interesting to hear accusations of Nimbyism. Everybody realises that people need houses to live in. NCC has put people in a defensive position by deciding that their sun, privacy, gardens, and amenity values will be taken away. The Council should understand that their approach to Plan Change 29 that lacks expertise, planning and design, and a lack of awareness of residents' rights and needs is causal. I refer to those people who have worked for much of their lives to buy and pay off their residential accommodation. 59 Wellington Street has also had numerous issues with storm water running into the property, being a low-level section, and sewerage bubbling up through the storm water trap. My mother happened to be overseas the last time this occurred, so it was the neighbourhood's waste flooding on to the section. This has happened on more than one occasion, which the Council is aware of. If this happens in high rainfall events, how will 77 units next door affect the already outdated and struggling infrastructure.	Accept in part	Section 12
3153	S750.011	Julie Carter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Remove the Education Board Land from the plan.	In terms of educational facilities there are plenty in this area, Nelson Girls College, preparatory intermediate school, Hampden Street School, and a pre-school just across the road. Yet the plan for the tower blocks is for 77 1- and 1.5-bedroom units - not places for families.	Reject	Section 12
3154	S752.001	Helke Florkowski	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S752.002.	Reject	Section 13
3155	S752.002	Helke Florkowski	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. That the people of Nelson are still not well informed about the plan changes as little information was actually sent out. NCC has published drawings of buildings and their shadows that are misleading. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3156	S752.003	Helke Florkowski	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting. Trudie Brand and Rohan O'Neill-Stevens are not neutral in their positions. [Refer to original submission for more detail.]	Reject	Section 13
3157	S752.004	Helke Florkowski	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ. Te Whatu Ora is proposing growth in the retirement population but shrinkage of families and children. [Refer to original submission for more detail.]	Reject	Section 10

3158	S752.006	Helke Florkowski	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S752.005.	Reject	Section 13
3159	S752.010	Helke Florkowski	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. Developing certain preferred zones to high density living is taking away some of the nicest parts of Nelson that have been praised by a lot of visitors. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3160	S752.011	Helke Florkowski	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 12
3161	FS28.056	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 in part	Section 12
3162	S752.013	Helke Florkowski	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. Eg Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3163	S752.018	Helke Florkowski	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S752.005 and S752.011.	Reject	Section 13
3164	S752.019	Helke Florkowski	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3165	S752.027	Helke Florkowski	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
3166	S752.029	Helke Florkowski	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

3167	S752.030	Helke Florkowski	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3168	S753.001	Alan Harding	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject the plan change 29 as proposed.	We are very blessed to be living here. We have a great geographical diversity, what a setting, it is wonderful to be able to see hills as a backdrop from just about any street in town. It is wonderful to have so many beaches within the region. It is great to be so close to three national parks and to the Marlborough Sounds. It is wonderful to be able to experience the four seasons and yet have one of the best climates in the world. We are also well blessed by the great endeavours of Nelsonians in the past creating a town of the character of Nelson and with infrastructure benefitting not just this region but the whole top of the south. There are very few towns in New Zealand that have the happy combination of geographic diversity, character heritage, climate and the yet to be realised potential. We have to celebrate what we have. When we celebrate what we have and build on our potential there will be strong revenue stream flowing into Nelson commerce. The NCC Planning Department and in fact the whole of council will be doing a disservice to the potential commerce and well being of this wonderful character town if they go ahead and change the planning regulations as proposed in PC29. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject in part	Section 9
3169	FS78.326	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Reject the plan change 29 as proposed: There are very few towns in New Zealand that have the happy combination of geographic diversity, character heritage, climate and the yet to be realised potential. I have to celebrate what I have. 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 12
3170	FS65.367	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Reject the plan change 29 as proposed: There are very few towns in New Zealand that have the happy combination of geographic diversity, character heritage, climate and the yet to be realised potential. We have to celebrate what we have. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
3171	S753.002	Alan Harding	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider the proposed plan change in the context of what is the most advantageous long-term plan for Nelson as an attractive town for tourism benefitting both commerce and well well-being of its citizens.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S753.001 and the original submission for more detail. My submission is not directed immediately at the issue of 'How do we implement this requirement for intensification', but I am stepping back and asking 'What is the vision for Nelson that we would like to see, and what is the most advantageous way for Nelson to have a robust commerce to achieve that vision, and then I ask how we can make intensification part of that vision.	Reject	Section 9
3172	S754.001	Jan Jordan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S754.002.	Reject	Section 9

3173	S754.002	Jan Jordan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. Council planning staff have stated at numerous meeting "this is a Broad Bush approach" that has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that required the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can redesign it. Despite numerous requests, NCC has refused to contact by email or letter, all its ratepayers. Over 19 submissions were lodged opposing the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy (NTFDS) proposal that areas in Tahunanui be zoned suitable for 6 storey buildings. We have often been told at public meetings on PC29 held by NCC that PC29 is based on the NTFDS and the submissions received on that. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3174	S754.003	Jan Jordan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent hearing panel (no current Councillors) to hear the submissions, and if that is not possible, appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, and if that is not possible, add two well qualified people who are not current Councillors to the Hearing Panel (for example, a demographer or a professional member of Nelson Tasman 2050).	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3175	S754.004	Jan Jordan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3176	S754.006	Jan Jordan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S754.005.	Reject	Section 13
3177	S754.010	Jan Jordan	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3178	S754.011	Jan Jordan	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 12

3179	FS28.057	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 in part	Section 12
3180	S754.013	Jan Jordan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3181	S754.018	Jan Jordan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S754.005 and S754.011.	Reject	Section 13
3182	S754.019	Jan Jordan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3183	S754.027	Jan Jordan	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. Impacts on mental health of living in multi-storey buildings providing social housing need to be considered. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3184	S754.029	Jan Jordan	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3185	S754.030	Jan Jordan	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3186	S754.032	Jan Jordan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Notify all ratepayers] directly by email or letter [about PC29], [or] at the very least, those property owners who will be directly affected by their property's zone being changed.	[All ratepayers] will be affected either directly or indirectly. Many property owners were in other parts of the country or overseas when PC29 was publicly notified and therefore likely to be unaware that their property is to be rezoned. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

3187	S754.035	Jan Jordan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider advice from Nelson Tasman 2050.	Nelson Tasman 2050 'is an independent think tank of built environment professionals sketching pathways towards a better future. Our mission is to help create vibrant communities through advocating, promoting and supporting our transition to resilient, sustainable, affordable, equitable and community-focused urban environments through quality intensification.'	Accept in part	Section 9
3188	S754.039	Jan Jordan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] that Council identify and assess the social impact of PC29 and identifies strategies that might mitigated any potential effects on well-being and Nelson society in general.	The section 32 evaluation report is inadequate. This report does not fully consider the risk and impact to people's health, lifestyle and property value if a multi-storey building, especially over two storeys, is built next to them.	Reject	Section 13
3189	S756.001	Lorraine Talley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety	There are no substantiable 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 site". If implemented the proposal will affect me, and the amenities | currently enjoy, personally and negatively, particularly in terms of blocking sunlight and daylight from my property, aggravating existing traffic problems in Examiner St, and reducing the value of my property. Other reasons include: - Council is not a Tier 1 City, and the proposal (and its supporting papers) includes no reason why the Council has chosen to (in effect) adopt the Tier 1 Rules. - if the proposal is 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 possible building of several 6 storey blocks of residential apartments in the Residential Zones will change (to the detriment of all residents) the character of Nelson. - Lack of evidence to support the change. - Intensification can be encouraged in other ways. - Infrastructure constraints.	Reject	Section 9
3190	FS78.328	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: The possible building of several 6 storey blocks of residential apartments in the Residential Zones will change (to the detriment of all residents) the character of 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
3191	FS65.370	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: The possible building of several 6 storey blocks of residential apartments in the Residential Zones will change (to the detriment of all residents) the character of Nelson. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
3192	S756.002	Lorraine Talley	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete the High Density Residential zone in its entirety.	Refer to reasons in submission point S756.001.	Reject	Section 9
3193	S757.001	Kathryn McDonald	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	The proposed plan should be discarded and re-developed in accordance with tier two requirements.	Pease do not les this plan change go ahead - it would totally change the character of Nelson and have a negative impact on the population. As a tier two city, Nelson is not required to follow the dictates from Wellington re intensification.	Reject	Section 9

3194	S757.002	Kathryn McDonald	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Provide] incentives, e.g. interest-free loans to people wishing to subdivide large sections [to assist with] resource consents and infrastructure [costs].	The proposed plan change is likely to only benefit developers, not residents.	Reject	Section 4
3195	S757.008	Kathryn McDonald	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Any development should preserve sufficient space for greenery, including trees.	You cannot have infinite growth in a finite world. We need sustainable economics, not large-scale developments which increase global warming and lead to biodiversity loss. High rise developments have no place in a 'smart little city' such as Nelson.	Reject	Section 11
3196	S758.001	Patrick Cronin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject plan change 29 [inferred].	I am against Plan change 29 for the following reasons: Nelson is a small provincial town and its main function and attraction is to be a community hub which meets the needs of the population. It is misleading to refer to Nelson CBO as though it were identical with the "city." The CBO does not exist primarily to further business interests or be a source of income for developers. Hence the plan to "Intensify" by "building upwards" will create the same problems that were experienced in post-war Britain where high-rise accommodation was hailed as the solution to homelessness. Most of those buildings have since been demolished because they created huge problems to the communities in which they were situated. We should learn from the mistakes of others. Finally, I am dismayed to see that the NCC Councillors Rohan O'Neill-Stevens and Trudy Brand are to be part of the commission of THREE to be hearing the submissions when both of them have publicly expressed support for Plan Change 29.	Reject	Section 9
3197	S759.001	Richard Chadderton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC 29 in its entirety [inferred].	I oppose the plan change in its entirety because it is a plan without a strategy. It followed a concept of more (higher, greater) and not better.	Accept in part	Section 12
3198	S759.002	Richard Chadderton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prepare a new plan through a process incorporating community / neighbourhood design with a vision for Nelson in 50 years [inferred].	Nelson is at an age and stage where the plan changes around the permanent intensification of urban centres is driving a fundamental change to our city. As it has in all great cities around the world., This change requires greater respect than PC29 affords. The plan needs to be more imaginative, envisaging Nelson, spatially, in fifty years, e.g. combining lots, cross-lot development, urban design masterplans and funding/investment (spatial plan please). I would like to see community-approved design guides that envisage Nelson in fifty years. On the one hand, this is too difficult if we try to be too prescriptive. However, PC29 offers open license on disaggregated design, self-interest, incohesiveness, poor 'human' linkages, poor 'natural/nature' linkages and overall missed opportunity.	Reject	Section 13
3199	S759.003	Richard Chadderton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Establish an urban design panel to collaborate on preparation of a redesigned plan.	A strengthened urban design panel is needed to create a 'masterplan', supported by funding and infrastructure development drafted in collaboration with an urban design agency. UDP needs to consider what Nelson could be, should be, and must be for climate change. All in the context of mana whenua, please. Human cities, smart cities.	Accept in part	Section 13
3200	S759.004	Richard Chadderton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise an incremental approach to intensification from the city centre out.	Intensification needs to be incremental, from the centre out, with the context of UDP output. The current big-band approach is lazy and lacks vision and purpose - other than 'more'.	Reject	Section 10
3201	S759.005	Richard Chadderton	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Remove bureaucratic impediments to development [inferred].	Qualitative standards need to be taken away from local councils. They have become bureaucratic, expensive, highly risk averse and probably the single greatest impediment to development in NZ (plenty of better models, internationally).	Reject	Section 13
3202	S763.004	Jilly Blackman Stevens	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 S763.001.	Accept in part	Section 12

3203	S763.006	Jilly Blackman Stevens	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	The Council will first consider housing intensification within the city before implementing the current change in zoning. Refer to reasons in submission points S763.001 and S763.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3204	S763.010	Jilly Blackman Stevens	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S763.008 and S763.009 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3205	S763.013	Jilly Blackman Stevens	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Set up a Commissioning Committee of unbiased counsellors [Rohan O'Neill-Stevens muted] to aid clarity and expedition.	The Council enhance the currently cumbersome process residents are dealing with where information if often difficult to follow then equally difficult to respond to.	Reject	Section 13
3206	S764.001	Elise Tull	Mapping	Oppose	Remove Stoke from high density zone for the impact it would have on residents.	Neale Ave borders on commercial use, supermarkets, parking and infrastructure. There is an elderly population, and growing here which appreciates the lifestyle and pace. Respect the ages and lifestyles of all residents. Could promote unease for nearby residents regarding general valuation of their homes and sections.	Accept	Section 12
3207	S764.002	Elise Tull	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Direct [intensification] to greater Nelson CBD.	Refer to reasons in submission point S764.001.	Reject	Section 12
3208	S764.007	Elise Tull	Infrastructure	Oppose in part	Strengthen infrastructure.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3209	S765.001	Amanda Munting-Kilwarth	Mapping	Support	Retain the HDZ within the areas proposed in the notified plan [inferred].	I support the new high density residential zone (HRZ) areas proposed. These are city fringe properties where more intensive residential development is much needed - we need a more vibrant and populated inner city. This also prevents urban sprawl into productive land.	Reject	Section 12
3210	S765.003	Amanda Munting-Kilwarth	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Prepare neighbourhood plans with an independent design committee.	We need neighbourhood plans drawn up for the city outlining specific goals for each area with an independent design committee to provide a cohesive and carefully considered approach over time. We don't want a piecemeal approach.	Reject	Section 13
3211	FS65.373	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: Prepare neighbourhood plans with an independent design committee. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
3212	S769.001	Peter Fierek	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC 29 in its entirety,	Refer to reasons in submission point S769.002.	Reject	Section 9
3213	S769.002	Peter Fierek	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public consultation.	I have no time and knowledge to understand the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. I have found PC 29 lacking in early public engagement and consultation by Council. The severe lack of trust between residents and Council has become significant. Information regarding the negative impacts on existing residents of their properties has required individuals to research PC 29 to find out these aspects and share them with the wider public.	Reject	Section 13
3214	S769.003	Peter Fierek	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	I disagree with the make-up of the hearing panel, because of its 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3215	S769.006	Peter Fierek	Mapping	Oppose	Amend or remove the High Density Residential Zone in its current form [inferred].	I believe we do need to intensify but I strongly oppose the High-Density Residential Zone in its current form. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb. My property and the adjacent neighbouring property in the west both would fall under the High Density Residential Zone (HRZ). If a dwelling would be allowed to be built to its maximum extent based on the new rules it would completely dwarf my house and have an immense negative impact onto my property. [Refer to original submission and attached diagrams for more detail.]	Accept in part	Section 12

3216	S769.008	Peter Fierek	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Implement rules to ensure new developments do not become holiday apartments and Airbnbs that sit empty for long periods.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 12
3217	S770.001	Wainui Properties Limited	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Requested that the summary of submissions prepared in the next phase be undertaken in such a manner that this be prepared and made available by provision.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3218	FS78.437	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 12
3219	S771.002	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can formulate and articulate a suitable response. We have e have found the PC29 proposal to be rushed and would like it to be laid out to the public in a way that most people can understand and digest for example: provide 3D drawings so we can have a true visual of the impact some of these proposed high rise buildings will have on the surrounding areas. The supporting documentation for the PC29 has so much jargon with allot of pages to it that most people either don't have the time or capability of deciphering what the proposals for our beautiful city are. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3220	S771.003	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3221	S771.004	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ. [Refer to original submission for more detail.]	Reject	Section 10
3222	S771.006	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S771.005.	Reject	Section 13
3223	S771.010	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3224	S771.011	Trish and Charlie Goulter	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 12

3225	FS28.058	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 in part	Section 12
3226	S771.013	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3227	S771.018	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S771.005 and S771.011.	Reject	Section 13
3228	S771.019	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3229	S771.027	Trish and Charlie Goulter	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
3230	S771.029	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3231	S771.030	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

3232	S772.001	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	Entire Plan Change	Support	Supports Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand submission [submission S901].	Summerset is one of New Zealand's leading and fastest growing retirement village operators, with more than 7,400 residents living in our village communities. We offer a range of independent living options and care, meaning that as our residents' needs change, we have support and options within the village. Summerset has 39 villages which are either completed or in development, spanning from Whangārei to Dunedin. We employ over 2,400 staff members across our various sites. Summerset welcomes the opportunity to provide feedback to the Council on its Plan Change 29 to enable the intensification of development in substantial alignment with the Medium Density Residential Standards. Summerset wishes to express its support for the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand in its entirety. Summerset requests the Council engages constructively with the Retirement Villages Association in relation to Council's Proposed Plan Change. Summerset could not gain advantage in trade competition through this submission. Summerset does wish to be heard in support of its submission. If others are making a similar submission, Summerset would consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.	Reject	Section 9
3233	FS78.334	Sarah Holman		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission I oppose is: The Submitter supports PC 29 and seeks that it be approved. 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 12
3234	FS65.380	Heritage Nelson		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission we oppose is: The Submitter supports PC 29 and seeks that it be approved. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
3235	FS78.438	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 12
3236	S773.001	Duncan Murray and Bridget Helen Unsworth	Entire Plan Change	Support	Approve PC 29.	The Submitter supports PC 29 and seeks that it be approved.	Accept	Section 9
3237	S773.004	Duncan Murray and Bridget Helen Unsworth	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	If the relief sought in decision point S773.002 and S773.003 is not accepted, the Submitter seeks that PC29 be declined.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 9
3238	S774.001	Allison McNabb	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw Plan Change 29 or alter it entirely after full consideration and public discussion on properly established population growth expectations.	The problem has been determined as a current and forecast lack of housing in Nelson. In the opinion of two senior Demographic experts, Dr Geoffery Hayes and Professor Jackson, the method used to establish the population growth used to justify the need for Plan Change 29 is "seriously flawed". We are advised by council that there is also pressure from Tasman District Council for Nelson City Council to "do our share" in the battle against urban sprawl which particularly in Tasman is spreading at speed across highly productive fruit and dairy farming land. No-one wants this. [Refer to the submission for further discussion on this point.]	Reject	Section 9
3239	FS83.217	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12

3240	S774.002	Allison McNabb	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Do not progress Plan Change 29 until the need is determined from data that is solid and accurate and the need properly determined.	Any forecast is no more than a speculative guess unless the requirement for housing has been properly investigated. To do this should involve an in depth look at the demographics and the available land and housing preferences by those are fortunate enough to own now or reasonably expect to own in the foreseeable future. PC29 appears to assume that an increase in housing will make properties more affordable. There is absolutely no evidence that I can find in any other desirable location that this is a realistic expectation. Living in a desirable location always costs more. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3241	FS83.218	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
3242	S774.004	Allison McNabb	Residential Zones	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential zone.	The Environment Court has already determined that pushing high density social housing in predominantly residential areas will alter the nature of the community and has overturned the consent that had allowed it. Overseas studies clearly indicate that high density social housing is closely linked to an increase in crime and anti social behaviour. Why then do we want to allow this to occur in our city. Social housing is an important facet of our society but in order not to exacerbate the problem or continue the cycle of lack of advantage social housing needs to be integrated into the communities where its placed in a manner that does not overwhelm them. The Environment Court has acknowledged this danger and supported the communities involved by overturning consent. Having a multi story building blocking out much of the sun in those neighbourhoods that are already facing the loss of their community is surely untenable. I submit that HDZ's may be required in the future but that Nelson has the advantage of taking a "wait and see" approach so as to be able to reasonably address the Environmental courts and community effects over time before considering such changes for Nelson. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3243	FS83.220	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
3244	S774.006	Allison McNabb	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Any changes that have been proposed to allow building density above that required by Tier 2 for any reason, be completely removed.	Nelson City Council reported at the time that it had requested the Select Committee on the Enabling Housing Supply Bill to include Nelson City in Tier One. This request was not granted therefore the creation of HDZs in is not mandated. I am therefore concerned at the unnecessary and severe impact this may have, particularly on residential properties in the vicinity of any of the proposed HDZs outside the Inner City-Centre. We are aware that NCC has included the social housing provider, Kainga Ora, in its discussions, presumably as a stakeholder. The ratepayers of Nelson, who we would consider having been very poorly informed, were not considered high enough on the stakeholder list to be allowed input (and the FDS does not translate to consultation on these changes) and had no prior knowledge of the dramatic changes that were proposed. Nelson is not a Tier 1 City and should not be subjected to Tier 1 planning. Tier 2 allows for intensification at a level that the Government determined was sufficient and this should be the planning scope that is adhered to.	Reject	Section 9
3245	FS83.222	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
3246	S774.008	Allison McNabb	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Replace one of the council panellists with a councillor who has consistently voted against the plan, or by appointing two more panellists from Nelson City Council who have consistently voted against Plan Change 29.	I do agree that local councillors should better understand the desires of the Nelson people than any panellist from outside the region. I believe it is incumbent on council to correct this situation of bias.	Reject	Section 13
3247	FS83.224	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12

3248	S775.001	Richard Daniell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject plan change 29 [inferred], retain the NRMP with some well thought out tweaks.	The rationale given by Nelson City Council for plan change 29 on its website is to (i) accommodate population growth, (ii) fulfill obligations Nelson city has in relation to a national policy statement, and to (ii) meet a housing need in Nelson. Two of these three arguments are deeply-flawed. It is misleading of council to claim that it has an intensification obligation of this magnitude under the national policy statement, it does not. To knowingly promulgate the notion that there is such a demanding obligation is wrong. Fundamentally population changes across New Zealand are static, and forecast to decline. Accommodating population is therefore not a valid objective. Nelson is already highly dependent on population growth as part of the unsustainable illusion of economic growth. A consequence of the Plan Change 29 will be to further increase our dependence on the unsustainability of population growth. Unaffordable housing is not just about house supply, it is also determined by demand and by earnings to price ratio. A headlong rush to cheaper, high density housing will not solve the problem, it will make it worse. The people who could lead Nelson to a brighter future will not want to live in or near high-density low-cost housing. Consequently, the proposed solution embodied by Plan Change 29 will mean a loss of talent, lower value jobs, lower income and houses that are more unaffordable. The wholesale changes proposed are strategically naïve, poorly thought through and will fail to meet their objectives. There are many better alternatives to the proposed direction of the city. The old plan would be better, although no doubt it could do with some well thought out tweaks. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
3249	FS78.180	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
3250	S776.001	Warwick Rogers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S776.002.	Reject	Section 13
3251	S776.002	Warwick Rogers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3252	S776.003	Warwick Rogers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3253	S776.004	Warwick Rogers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
3254	S776.006	Warwick Rogers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S776.005.	Reject	Section 13

3255	S776.010	Warwick Rogers	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone and Medium Density Residental Zone from the plan completely.	I strongly oppose the High-Density Residential Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
3256	S776.011	Warwick Rogers	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 12
3257	FS28.059	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 in part	Section 12
3258	S776.013	Warwick Rogers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3259	S776.018	Warwick Rogers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S776.005 and S776.011.	Reject	Section 13
3260	S776.019	Warwick Rogers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3261	S776.027	Warwick Rogers	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
3262	S776.029	Warwick Rogers	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3263	S776.030	Warwick Rogers	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

3264	S777.001	Trafalgar House Limited	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support Plan Change 29.	[PC29] encourages and provides for intensification of the Inner City (City Centre and Fringe). It is considered that the provisions that provide for intensification of the City will lead to: A more efficient use and development of the land resource; and Lead to a more vibrant City Centre; Achieve the key objectives of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development; Achieve the key outcomes contained in the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy; Achieve the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.	Accept in part	Section 12
3265	FS78.439	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 12
3266	S778.001	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S778.002.	Reject	Section 13
3267	S778.002	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	While I agree that housing in Nelson needs to be intensified, I feel the proposed PC 29 is very lengthy and complex to understand and likely difficult to implement. Access to a hard copy of the plan and reports has proved difficult and was not made easily available for residents who couldn't access (or preferred not to view it) on a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can formulate and articulate a suitable response. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
3268	S778.003	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3269	S778.006	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S778.005.	Reject	Section 13
3270	S778.010	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3271	S778.011	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	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 12
3272	FS28.060	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 in part	Section 12
3273	S778.013	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13

3274	S778.018	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S778.005 and S778.011.	Reject	Section 13
3275	S778.019	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3276	S778.027	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	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. As a parent of young children who are scared to walk past Franklin Village alone, I am concerned that potential developments of multi-story single room apartments for social housing rather than integrated, mixed type dwellings will adversely affect safety and perceived safety of the areas they are in. Currently my children walk a long way around the hospital area to attend school to avoid the groups that congregate outside the Franklin building. I am concerned there is potential for a similar building at the Examiner St site which is nearby the Girls College and on the route to Hampden Street School. There are many ways to address this successfully as in other cities without the creation of potential future ghettos.	Reject	Section 13
3277	S778.029	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3278	S778.030	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

3279	S779.001	Yvonne Graham	Residential Zones	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29. Consider other options for intensification and infrastructure.	Van Diemen Street is at maximum density: Driveways exit alongside almost all front properties onto a narrow and dangerous road. The previous change in zoning from Residential 1 to a sub-Collector Road resulted in entirely predictable accidents on a regular basis: ambulances, smashed wing mirrors, and early morning upturned cars on the "race track" into town. The density of traffic from the south and Richmond prevents residents from crossing the road for hours daily. Recently I saw a large bus swaying close to the kerb at end of school time with small children on the narrow path alongside. Of note, there is no continuous footpath on the upper side at the top end of the street, and Fairfield Park has no path around the top lower side of van Diemen. A once beautiful heritage street has been turned into one of "two most dangerous streets in Nelson" by a previous decision to change the zoning without any consultation with the residents.	Reject	Section 9
3280	FS65.388	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Van Diemen Street is at maximum density: A once beautiful heritage street has been turned into one of "two most dangerous streets in Nelson" by a previous decision to change the zoning without any consultation with the residents. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
3281	S781.001	Michael Rose (Rose Family Trust)	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	I reject PC29 in its entirety. Refer to reasons in submission points S781.003 - S781.007.	Reject	Section 9
3282	S781.002	Michael Rose (Rose Family Trust)	Entire Plan Change	Support	Prioritise intensification within the inner city before moving onto existing residential neighbourhoods [inferred].	We support the proposed increase in residential density in the inner city with mixed residential and commercial zones as these areas provide residents with direct walkable access to shopping and public transport services. The inner city should be the starting place for the most significant intensification before moving onto existing residential neighbourhoods.	Accept in part	Section 12
3283	S781.003	Michael Rose (Rose Family Trust)	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.	We oppose the proposed HDZ in residential areas where there is no walkable access to amenities (supermarkets, schools and public transport).	Accept in part	Section 12
3284	S781.007	Michael Rose (Rose Family Trust)	Mapping	Oppose	Remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ.	If HDZ are approved for some areas, we particularly oppose the proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills area. We ask the Council to remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZand make it GRZ because of ongoing slope instability in this area, lack of infrastructure, lack of the essential amenities (no supermarkets or public transport) within walking distance, and the increased likelihood of slips directly caused by intensification development and frequent weather events. [Refer to the following sections of the original submission for more detail: 1. Slope Instability, 2. Amenities, 3. Traffic, 4. Sunlight and Shading Effects, 5. Trees and Gardens in the Tahunanui Hills HDZ, 6. Recreation, and 7. Intensification].	Accept in part	Section 12

3285	FS61.081	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- If HDZ are approved for some areas, we particularly oppose the proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills area. We ask the Council to remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ because of ongoing slope instability in this area, lack of infrastructure, lack of the essential amenities (no supermarkets or public transport) within walking distance, and the increased likelihood of slips directly caused by intensification development and frequent weather events. Reasons for my support: [Refer to the following sections of the original submission for more detail: 1. Slope Instability, 2. Amenities, 3. Traffic, 4. Sunlight and Shading Effects, 5. Trees and Gardens in the Tahunanui Hills HDZ, 6. Recreation, and 7. Intensification]. Reject PC29 in its entirety.	Accept in part	Section 12
3286	FS72.085	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- If HDZ are approved for some areas, we particularly oppose the proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills area. We ask the Council to remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ because of ongoing slope instability in this area, lack of infrastructure, lack of the essential amenities (no supermarkets or public transport) within walking distance, and the increased likelihood of slips directly caused by intensification development and frequent weather events. [Refer to the following sections of the original submission for more detail: 1. Slope Instability, 2. Amenities, 3. Traffic, 4. Sunlight and Shading Effects, 5. Trees and Gardens in the Tahunanui Hills HDZ, 6. Recreation, and 7. Intensification]. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Points 1-7 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3287	FS60.077	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- If HDZ are approved for some areas, we particularly oppose the proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills area. We ask the Council to remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ because of ongoing slope instability in this area, lack of infrastructure, lack of the essential amenities (no supermarkets or public transport) within walking distance, and the increased likelihood of slips directly caused by intensification development and frequent weather events. [Refer to the following sections of the original submission for more detail: 1. Slope Instability, 2. Amenities, 3. Traffic, 4. Sunlight and Shading Effects, 5. Trees and Gardens in the Tahunanui Hills HDZ, 6. Recreation, and 7. Intensification]. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Points 1-7 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3288	S781.008	Michael Rose (Rose Family Trust)	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Inform all rate payers individually with emails and letters about any changes to their property zoning and to give each ratepayer the opportunity to respond.	We have found the lack of early public engagement and consultation on Plan Change 29 extremely stressful. We only found out about the plan change by chance through a family member. There was no letter or email from the Nelson City Council. When we questioned this we were told we should have read the Nelson Evening Mail and we should have been looking on the Nelson City Council website. We have still received nothing by email or letter from the Council about the proposed change plan to our property.	Reject	Section 13
3289	S781.009	Michael Rose (Rose Family Trust)	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint independent hearing commissioners for the plan change.	We question why the hearing panel is not made up of independent hearing commissioners as it is a council led plan change.	Reject	Section 13
3290	S781.010	Michael Rose (Rose Family Trust)	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC for population growth which have informed the intensification requirements are not Statistics NZ medium projections.	Reject	Section 10

3291	S781.012	Michael Rose (Rose Family Trust)	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw PC29 and have planning staff refine the plan design and follow the proper procedure of consultation and public engagement.	In our opinion, the PC29 process needs to be paused and re-evaluated before progressing to the hearing stage.	Reject	Section 13
3292	S782.001	MGT Holdings Limited	Entire Plan Change	Support	PC29 is fully supported.	113 and 115 Kawai Street, have a combined area of 2396m2 so are and ideally suited to accommodate some of the residential growth that is anticipated in the coming decades. This part of the Nelson South is also close to schools, commercial services, employment, the Hospital and recreational opportunities that provide for an ideal location for higher density living. These sites are immediately adjoining Roundhay, a residential retirement village and with Franklyn Hall to the south, being an established high density residential development. In the context of this site and the wider area, PC29 is therefore fully supported.	Accept in part	Section 12
3293	S783.004	Susan Gibson	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 S783.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3294	S783.006	Susan Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S783.001 and S783.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3295	S783.007	Susan Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3296	S783.008	Susan Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3297	S783.009	Susan Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject] plan change 29 in its entirety, however, if plan change 29 is approved, I would like submission points S783.010 - S783.020 to be considered and changes made.	I do not support Plan Change 29 in its entirety.	Accept in part	Section 12
3298	S783.010	Susan Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seeks to restrict] high density to new subdivisions.	Make the new subdivisions high density so their future owners purchase [property] knowing what impact the neighbouring properties will have one them. [Buildings] can be built with appeal rather than squeezing them in between existing low levels buildings [and] avoid a poorly planned, visually unappealing community housing.	Reject	Section 12
3299	S783.013	Susan Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Place rules [on operation of] AirBnbs, host[ed] only or ban them.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 9
3300	S783.018	Susan Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seeks to] ensure there are a mix of users, dense housing needs to have homes [suitable] for families, couples, single people, pet owners, disabled, and retirees. [Consult with] the new occupants who will live in these developments [to understand their needs].	Six storey apartments [are unsuitable] for [families, pet owners], are unaffordable for most single people, and are not suitable long term [for couples that want children]. Fire doors are unmanageable for elderly or disabled. If not designed well with individual green spaces or shared green space, mental health can be affected. They are good for holiday homes and AirBnbs [and] 3 existing buildings only have permanent occupancy of 30-50%.	Reject	Section 13
3301	S783.020	Susan Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	I ask that Nelson Council be open to change and consideration of its community to achieve a future design for Nelson that we can all be proud of. I ask that you listen to your community and work with your community as a team.	Measuring the response and feedback from Nelson community, it is unlikely that PC29 has been driven by community opinion, happiness, lifestyle, or mental health.	Reject in part	Section 13
3302	S784.004	Pauline Allen	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 S784.001.	Accept in part	Section 12

3303	S784.006	Pauline Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S784.001 and S784.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3304	S784.007	Pauline Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3305	S784.008	Pauline Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages,	Reject	Section 13
3306	S785.004	Christine Hansen	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 S785.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3307	S785.006	Christine Hansen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S785.001 and S785.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3308	S785.009	Christine Hansen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S785.007 and S785.008 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3309	S785.011	Christine Hansen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submission in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3310	S785.012	Christine Hansen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because for the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtney's proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3311	S785.014	Christine Hansen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and activitely facitilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S785.013.	Reject	Section 13
3312	S785.017	Christine Hansen	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3313	S785.018	Christine Hansen	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 12
3314	FS28.061	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 in part	Section 12

3315	S785.022	Christine Hansen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) within the Residential Zones if required and over time.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete public consultation between phasing giving a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3316	S785.027	Christine Hansen	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. Green spaces need to be included. 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
3317	S785.029	Christine Hansen	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3318	S785.030	Christine Hansen	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3319	S786.004	David Allen	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 S785.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3320	S786.006	David Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S786.001 and S786.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3321	S786.007	David Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3322	S786.008	David Allen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3323	S787.004	Roger Wilson	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 S787.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3324	S787.006	Roger Wilson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S787.001 and S787.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3325	S787.011	Roger Wilson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points s787.009 and s787.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3326	S788.004	Neal Rhodes	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 S788.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3327	S788.006	Neal Rhodes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S788.001 and S788.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12

3328	S788.011	Neal Rhodes	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S788.009 and S788.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3329	S789.004	Barry Beams	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 S789.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3330	S789.006	Barry Beams	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S789.001 and S789.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3331	S789.011	Barry Beams	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S789.009 and S789.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3332	S790.004	Yvonne Beams	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 S790.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3333	S790.006	Yvonne Beams	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S790.001 and S790.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3334	S790.011	Yvonne Beams	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S790.009 and S790.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3335	S791.004	Simon Kelly	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 S791.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3336	S791.006	Simon Kelly	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S791.001 and S791.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3337	S791.011	Simon Kelly	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S791.009 and S791.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3338	S792.006	Michelle Viskovich	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S792.001 and S792.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3339	S792.011	Michelle Viskovich	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S792.009 and S792.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3340	S792.012	Michelle Viskovich	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Spread outwards into farmlands.	Not stated.	Accept in part	Section 12
3341	S793.004	Charlotte Townsend	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 S793.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3342	S793.006	Charlotte Townsend	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S793.001 and S793.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12

3343	S793.011	Charlotte Townsend	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S793.009 and S793.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3344	S794.004	Deanna Chapman	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 S794.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3345	S794.006	Deanna Chapman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S794.001 and S794.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3346	S794.011	Deanna Chapman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S794.009 and S794.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3347	S795.004	Colleen Kidson	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 S795.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3348	S795.006	Colleen Kidson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S795.001 and S795.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3349	S795.011	Colleen Kidson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S795.009 and S795.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3350	S796.004	Deborah Verdonk	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 S796.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3351	S796.006	Deborah Verdonk	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S796.001 and S796.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3352	S796.011	Deborah Verdonk	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S796.009 and S796.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3353	S797.004	Jocelyn Tucker	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 S797.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3354	S797.006	Jocelyn Tucker	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S797.001 and S797.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3355	S797.011	Jocelyn Tucker	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S797.009 and S797.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3356	S798.004	Ron Tucker	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 S798.001.	Accept in part	Section 12

3357	S798.006	Ron Tucker	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S798.001 and S798.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3358	S798.011	Ron Tucker	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S798.009 and S798.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3359	S799.004	Heather McAlister	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 S799.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3360	S799.006	Heather McAlister	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S799.001 and S799.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3361	S799.011	Heather McAlister	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S799.009 and S799.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3362	S800.004	Jill Stevenson	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 S800.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3363	S800.006	Jill Stevenson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S800.001 and S800.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3364	FS60.128	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- I oppose the loss of the existing protection for sunlight to all properties, because it is critical component of residential amenity in a City as it provides warmth and energy efficiency. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Accept in part	Section 12
3365	S800.011	Jill Stevenson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S800.009 and S800.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3366	S801.004	Allison Tuckwell	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 S801.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3367	S801.006	Allison Tuckwell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S801.001 and S801.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3368	S801.011	Allison Tuckwell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S801.009 and S801.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3369	S802.004	Garry Way	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 S802.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3370	S802.006	Garry Way	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S802.001 and S802.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12

3371	S802.011	Garry Way	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S802.009 and S802.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3372	S803.004	Oxana Edmonds	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 S803.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3373	S803.006	Oxana Edmonds	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S803.001 and S803.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3374	S803.011	Oxana Edmonds	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S803.009 and S803.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3375	S804.004	Robert Edmonds	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 S804.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3376	S804.006	Robert Edmonds	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S804.001 and S804.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3377	S804.011	Robert Edmonds	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S804.009 and S804.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3378	S805.001	Lesley Abrey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29 in its entirety.	I reject Plan Change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3379	S805.003	Lesley Abrey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors from either side of the Sept 14th vote [to the hearing panel].	I disagree with the make-up of the hearing panel, because of its biased public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtney's proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3380	S805.004	Lesley Abrey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods, with a variety of high quality housing choices.	Careful design controls (from the concept stage onward) must be undertaken in order to prevent Nelson from becoming an unsightly hotchpotch urban landscape. Residential neighbourhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy and new developments thoughtfully designed and planned on a neighbourhood, by neighbourhood basis, to maintain the essence of their character. Green space, trees and landscaping are essential aspects of all neighbourhoods and definitely assist in the wellbeing of residents, plus help to provide an important part of the attraction of Nelson - which must all be considered during developing the growth of Nelson.	Reject	Section 13
3381	S805.005	Lesley Abrey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Prioritise] high-rise intensification in the Nelson CBD and then mid-rise in adjoining areas before considering residential suburbs.	I am in support of progressively phased intensification which is design led, but not 'zones' which are designated by drawing a few lines on a map.	Reject	Section 10
3382	S805.009	Lesley Abrey	Mapping	Oppose	Apply the General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district on the introduciton 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.	Refer to reasons in submission points S805.008 and S805.010.	Reject	Section 9

3383	S805.011	Lesley Abrey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Re-think the approach to intensification and provide a more nuanced approach.	The government has not mandated for Nelson (a tier two city) to intensify to the degree that this PC 29 indicates. It seems that NCC has unnecessarily inflated the projection figures for population growth.	Reject	Section 9
3384	S806.004	Selina Wilkinson	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 S806.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3385	S806.006	Selina Wilkinson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S806.001 and S806.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3386	S806.007	Selina Wilkinson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3387	S806.008	Selina Wilkinson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3388	S807.001	Diana Lau	Residential Zones	Not Stated	[Include] a policy to first [prepare] comprehensive neighbourhood plans for all medium and high density zones, with such plans to be agreed with the community.	This will give certainty about form and location of future buildings, open spaces, etc.	Reject	Section 13
3389	S807.002	Diana Lau	Residential Zones	Not Stated	[Include] a policy to first [prepare] comprehensive neighbourhood plans for all medium and high density zones, with such plans to be agreed with the community.	This will give certainty about form and location of future buildings, open spaces, etc.	Reject	Section 13
3390	S809.001	Jeanette Dungan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	I reject PC29 in its entirety. Refer to reasons in submission points S809.002 to S809.009.	Reject	Section 9
3391	S809.002	Jeanette Dungan	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request] all proposed HDZ have walkable access to a supermarket and bus service.	I oppose the proposed HDZ in residential areas where there is no walking access to amenities (supermarkets, schools, and public transport). I support the proposed increase in residential density in the inner city with mixed residential and commercial zones where there is walkable access to shopping and public transport services.	Accept in part	Section 12
3392	S809.005	Jeanette Dungan	Mapping	Oppose	Remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ.	I strongly oppose HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills area. I ask the Council to remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ because of ongoing slope instability in this area, lack of infrastructure, lack of the essential amenities (no supermarkets or public transport) within walking distance, and the increased likelihood of slips directly caused by intensification of development and frequent weather events. [Refer to the following sections of the original submission for more detail: 1. Slope Instability, 2. Amenities, 3. Traffic, 4. Sunlight and Shading Effects 5. Trees and Gardens, and 7. Intensification].	Accept in part	Section 12
3393	FS61.082	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- I strongly oppose HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills area. I ask the Council to remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ because of ongoing slope instability in this area, lack of infrastructure, lack of the essential amenities (no supermarkets or public transport) within walking distance, and the increased likelihood of slips directly caused by intensification of development and frequent weather events. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Agree HDZ should be removed from Tahunanui hills and replaced with GRZ.	Accept in part	Section 12

3394	FS72.086	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- I strongly oppose HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills area. I ask the Council to remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ because of ongoing slope instability in this area, lack of infrastructure, lack of the essential amenities (no supermarkets or public transport) within walking distance, and the increased likelihood of slips directly caused by intensification of development and frequent weather events. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Agree HDZ should be removed from Tahunanui hills and replaced with GRZ.	Accept in part	Section 12
3395	FS60.078	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- I strongly oppose HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills area. I ask the Council to remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ because of ongoing slope instability in this area, lack of infrastructure, lack of the essential amenities (no supermarkets or public transport) within walking distance, and the increased likelihood of slips directly caused by intensification of development and frequent weather events. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Agree HDZ should be removed from Tahunanui hills and replaced with GRZ.	Accept in part	Section 12
3396	S809.008	Jeanette Dungan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider fully the submissions and engage in further consultation with the residents of Tahunanui Hills.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 10
3397	S809.009	Jeanette Dungan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Inform [residents] by email or letter] about any zoning changes that will affect [their] properties.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3398	S810.006	Robert Bruce	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S810.001 and S810.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3399	S810.007	Robert Bruce	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3400	S810.008	Robert Bruce	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Not stated	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3401	S810.010	Robert Bruce	Inner City and City Fringe Zones	Not Stated	[Suggests] Intensifiying the inner city first!	Not stated.	Reject	Section 10
3402	S811.004	Narumon Glumglai	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 S811.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3403	S811.006	Narumon Glumglai	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S811.001 and S811.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3404	S811.007	Narumon Glumglai	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3405	S811.008	Narumon Glumglai	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3406	S813.001	Lorna Sygrove	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S813.002.	Reject	Section 13

3407	S813.002	Lorna Sygrove	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3408	S813.003	Lorna Sygrove	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint experts in urban and environmental design.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3409	S813.004	Lorna Sygrove	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
3410	S813.006	Lorna Sygrove	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S813.005.	Reject	Section 13
3411	S813.010	Lorna Sygrove	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3412	S813.011	Lorna Sygrove	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 12
3413	FS28.062	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 in part	Section 12
3414	S813.013	Lorna Sygrove	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3415	S813.018	Lorna Sygrove	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S813.005 and S813.011.	Reject	Section 13

3416	S813.019	Lorna Sygrove	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before moving into the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3417	S813.027	Lorna Sygrove	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
3418	S813.029	Lorna Sygrove	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3419	S813.030	Lorna Sygrove	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3420	S813.035	Lorna Sygrove	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to provide schooling for the growing population as the schools are currently at capacity.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3421	S813.036	Lorna Sygrove	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to provide extra GP clinics for the growing population as the GP surgeries are currently at capacity and consider the extra demand on hospital services for the growing population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3422	S813.037	Lorna Sygrove	Mapping	Oppose	Provide an area for housing development to replace the forested hills, in which careful planning involves large scale native planting, communal gardens, outdoor space, appropriate housing types, and potentially multi-storey apartments built against the hill in a way that they do not shade each other.	I do not support greenfield developments when they take up prime horticultural or recreational land. However, we have a problem with large areas of forestry close to residential areas, e.g. The Brook and Maitai Valleys. Exotic forests cause erosion as they change the acidity of the soil which in turn prevents any type of native undergrowth which would provide moisture retention healthy PH soil. The dryness of exotic forests creates a huge fire risk as we have seen in recent years. Here in Seymore Avenue we were on the brink of evacuation when an arsonist started a fire above Iwa Road.	Reject	Section 12
3423	S814.004	S. Wastney	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 S814.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3424	S814.006	S. Wastney	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S814.001 and S814.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3425	S814.007	S. Wastney	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3426	S814.008	S. Wastney	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13

3427	S815.004	Janice Sowman	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 S815.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3428	S815.006	Janice Sowman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S815.001 and S815.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3429	S815.009	Janice Sowman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S815.009 and S815.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3430	S816.001	Joanna Plows	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	While I acknowledge the intent of the plan change for benefits of intensification of urban living, I reject PC29 in its entirety but if the [Council] goes ahead with this plan, refer to the [decision requests and reasons] in submission points S816.002 to S816.023.	Reject	Section 9
3431	S816.002	Joanna Plows	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] a longer and fair time frame for submissions.	I have needed to attend meetings about [the plan change], not run by Council, to hear the important details and consequences of this plan. After public pressure and at the Public Meeting at Trafalgar Centre on 7 Sept, Mayor Smith stated that "this legislation on urban development is the most important that the council has undertaken". He was then challenged by citizens attending to extend the submission time as many citizens hadn't even yet heard of the proposal. This should have been realised by council and a longer and fair time frame allowed for submissions.	Reject	Section 13
3432	S816.003	Joanna Plows	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Immediately withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public consultation.	NCC should have been upfront about the negative impacts on existing residents' properties as listed by Steve Webster in his submission: Loss of winter sunlight with new recession planes. Loss of on street car parking with increased intensification due to no requirement for on-site car parking. Loss of privacy with bigger buildings that are closer to boundaries. Loss of property value with loss of views, sunlight, and privacy. Increased levels of noise with increased residential dwellings around a boundary. Residential unit numbers per building can be increased on a 'restricted discretionary' basis without notification or written approval. Exaggerated population forecasts. Council voted NOT to withdraw PC 29 on Sept 14th Meeting. Predetermined biased Councillors on the hearing panel.	Reject	Section 13
3433	S816.007	Joanna Plows	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	There should be a time cap on [empty] dwellings.	And has there been any research as to how many dwellings sit empty for long periods?	Reject	Section 10
3434	S816.011	Joanna Plows	Entire Plan Change	Amend	[Request that] all current possible in-fill options of lower storey buildings have been investigated and / or there is little or no shading / loss of daylight of existing properties.	Not stated.	Reject in part	Section 12
3435	S816.016	Joanna Plows	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29 to progressively phase intensification] starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required, and providing AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 10

3436	S816.023	Joanna Plows	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint councillors from either side of the Sept 14 vote on Councillor Courtney's proposal to withdraw PC29. If this is not adhered to, then I request all councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	For 'unbiased public perception', I request that NCC appoint councillors from either side of the Sept 14 vote on Councillor Courtney's proposal to withdraw PC29. If this is not adhered to, then I request all councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners. I support the submissions of Steve Webster and Geoffrey Hayes.	Reject	Section 13
3437	S817.003	Bruce and Pamela Thomas	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reconfigure the [hearing panel] to achieve a majority of membership of independent unbiased participants.	It is of concern to us that the Hearing Panel comprises NCC Counsellors only. We strongly recommend that it be reconfigured to achieve a majority membership of independent, unbiased participants.	Reject	Section 13
3438	S817.006	Bruce and Pamela Thomas	Entire Plan Change	Amend	[Require] consultation with local architects to achieve quality intensification design.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3439	S817.007	Bruce and Pamela Thomas	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Establish an independent regional urban development agency.	Establish an independent regional urban development agency to provide guidance and oversee development across Nelson in a more co-ordinated way, rather than the site by site basis as happens now. "It's about design-led solutions rather than developer-led solutions" (William Samuels, Nelson Weekly, 11 Oct 2023).	Reject	Section 13
3440	S817.011	Bruce and Pamela Thomas	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Take account of topographical landscape when considering resource consent requirements.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 12
3441	S817.017	Bruce and Pamela Thomas	Entire Plan Change	Amend	[Include] protection of existing green belts of established trees rather than grass playing fields.	Extremely important ecologically and also for healing and well-being.	Reject	Section 12
3442	S818.004	Anne Molloy	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 S818.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3443	S818.006	Anne Molloy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S818.001 and S818.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3444	S818.007	Anne Molloy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3445	S818.008	Anne Molloy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages,	Reject	Section 13
3446	S818.009	Anne Molloy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose PC29].	PC29 will change the whole feel, beauty, uniqueness, heritage, and specialness of Nelson. It is not considering people who actually reside in Nelson. It is a plan for people who may move to Nelson, who may afford/want to live in apartments. It does not value the uniqueness of this town or have respect for the people who actually live here.	Reject	Section 9
3447	FS78.347	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: PC29 will change the whole feel, beauty, uniqueness, heritage, and specialness of Nelson. It is not considering people who actually reside in Nelson. It is a plan for people who may move to Nelson, who may afford/want to live in apartments. It does not value the uniqueness of this town or have respect for the people who actually live here. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12

3448	FS65.401	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: PC29 will change the whole feel, beauty, uniqueness, heritage, and specialness of Nelson. It is not considering people who actually reside in Nelson. It is a plan for people who may move to Nelson, who may afford/want to live in apartments. It does not value the uniqueness of this town or have respect for the people who actually live here. 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 in part	Section 12
3449	S818.010	Anne Molloy	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Build high density town houses with green space outside of the city and provide suffiecent public transport.	Density in the city centre and creative housing in the industrial area in streets where 6 storey buildings do not block light from homes or change the whole feel of the street.	Reject	Section 12
3450	S819.004	Catherine Larson	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 S819.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3451	S819.006	Catherine Larson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S819.001 and S819.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3452	S819.007	Catherine Larson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3453	S819.008	Catherine Larson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3454	S821.004	Michael Cooper	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 S821.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3455	S821.006	Michael Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S821.001 and S821.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3456	S821.007	Michael Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3457	S821.008	Michael Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3458	S821.009	Michael Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Suggests] Limit the time a home can be empty, limit the cost of rentals, and [limit] the use of the accommodation being supplied in AirBnB.	This proposal is an invitation to unscrupulous development to create ghetto like suburbs.	Reject	Section 13
3459	S822.001	Christopher Geen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	Refer to reasons in submission point S822.002.	Reject	Section 13
3460	S822.002	Christopher Geen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

3461	S823.004	Chris Horner	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 S823.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3462	S823.006	Chris Horner	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S823.001 and S823.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3463	S823.007	Chris Horner	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3464	S823.008	Chris Horner	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3465	S824.001	Angela Geen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	Refer to reasons in submission point S824.002.	Reject	Section 13
3466	S824.002	Angela Geen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3467	S825.004	John Harrison	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 S825.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3468	S825.006	John Harrison	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S825.001 and S825.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3469	S825.007	John Harrison	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3470	S825.008	John Harrison	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3471	S825.009	John Harrison	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose PC29.	Lack of privacy. I would be over whelmed by height of apartments corridor between house and apartments would make the house and ground cold and moldy with lack of sunlight. Greater noise level.	Reject	Section 12
3472	S826.004	Edwin Morris	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 S826.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3473	S826.006	Edwin Morris	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S826.001 and S826.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3474	S826.007	Edwin Morris	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3475	S826.008	Edwin Morris	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3476	S826.009	Edwin Morris	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose] PC29.	I disagree whole heartedly to PC29 and the way it has been presented. There has been no community involvement and no design put foward as to how this will all look for Nelson.	Reject	Section 13

3477	S827.001	Keeley Gerrard	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject Plan Change 29].	I do not agree with PC 29. I do agree an intensification plan is needed for the future of our growing city but the overall design needs to be carefully orchestrated by a dedicated group of suitably qualified people that have vision and experience to create a dynamic, liveable community whilst respecting neighborhoods and the historical significance of our city. King St residents have spent the past two years living with the anxiety and uncertainty of a large housing development changing our community and losing daylight hours, increased traffic etc. Nelson City Council's Plan 29 has created the same stress to residents on a much larger scale.	Reject	Section 9
3478	FS65.403	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: I do agree an intensification plan is needed for the future of our growing city but the overall design needs to be carefully orchestrated by a dedicated group of suitably qualified people that have vision and experience to create a dynamic, liveable community whilst respecting neighbourhoods and the historical significance of our city [King Street]. 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 in part	Section 12
3479	S828.001	Michele Hite	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw Plan Change 29.	I oppose Plan Change 29 in its present form and suggest that it be withdrawn.	Reject	Section 9
3480	FS83.225	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all their submission points.	Reject	Section 12
3481	S828.002	Michele Hite	Residential Zones	Oppose	Apply the new General Residential zone category to the proposed High Density zone.	I do NOT support the proposed Medium Density and High Density provisions. The areas of the 'dress-circle' should be treated the same. There are many of the same types of character houses and bungalows on either side of the border of the proposed high and medium density zones. I do support town planning that is considerate of existing dwellings within residential areas, that would respect and cherish the sunlight access, heritage and residential character of Nelson. Tall modern buildings, situated adjacent to historic and character houses and bungalows is not a long-term vision for Nelson and its residents and visitors. Having spent many mornings 'meeting and greeting' visitors to the Cathedral, I appreciate that both locals and visitors value Nelson's residential areas to visit as much as things like the parks and art gallery.	Accept in part	Section 12
3482	FS78.349	Sarah Holman		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission I support is: Apply the new General Residential zone category to the proposed High Density zone. The areas of the 'dress-circle' should be treated the same. There are many of the same types of character houses and bungalows on either side of the border of the proposed high and medium density zones. I do support town planning that is considerate of existing dwellings within residential areas, that would respect and cherish the sunlight access, heritage and residential character of Nelson. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12

3483	FS65.404	Heritage Nelson		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular part of the submission we support is: Apply the new General Residential zone category to the proposed High Density zone. The areas of the 'dress-circle' should be treated the same. There are many of the same types of character houses and bungalows on either side of the border of the proposed high and medium density zones. I do support town planning that is considerate of existing dwellings within residential areas, that would respect and cherish the sunlight access, heritage and residential character of Nelson. 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.	Accept in part	Section 12
3484	FS83.226	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all their submission points.	Reject	Section 12
3485	S828.003	Michele Hite	Residential Zones	Oppose	Apply the new General Residential zone category to the proposed Medium Density zone.	Refer to reasons in submission point S828.002.	Accept in part	Section 12
3486	FS83.227	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all their submission points.	Reject	Section 12
3487	S828.008	Michele Hite	Mapping	Oppose	[Restrict] high density zones [and tall buildings] to the inner city CBD.	I propose that High Density zones should be kept primarily within the inner city CBD area where there are already taller buildings, built closely together and new ones would have less material impact on the quality of life of the inner city dwellers, who, (having lived on top of a couple of multi-story CBD commercial buildings in Christchurch in the 90's, myself) are prepared to trade-off the normal suburban pleasures for the convenience of the city at your doorstep.	Accept in part	Section 12
3488	FS83.232	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all their submission points.	Reject	Section 12
3489	S828.011	Michele Hite	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Please allow further public submissions on any revised version of Change Plan 29.	While I am grateful for the extended time frame for these submissions, a plan such as this is not proposed very often, and such sweeping change to the current rules requires much longer for public understanding and feedback. It is an extensive document and I am no town planner, but I do have concerns after familiarising myself with Plan Change 29, as much as I was able to do.	Reject	Section 13
3490	FS83.235	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all their submission points.	Reject	Section 12
3491	S829.003	Gabrielle Huygens	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] a reduction in rates until the current owner sells.	The change to existing building code requirements around daylight angles will significantly affect quality of life for people in immediate surrounding houses and the resale value of their properties. I realise that compensation is not possible or practical but maybe the Council could offer a reduction in rates until the current owner sells. Normally their rates would rise as their land value increases due to intensification, however I feel it is fair that the wider community via the council share some of the impact rather than a few unfortunate individuals.	Reject	Section 13
3492	S830.001	Errol Shaw	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S830.002.	Reject	Section 13
3493	S830.002	Errol Shaw	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff in conjunction with highly capable citizens to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	That I have found it difficult to comprehend the outcome of the proposed PC 29. The documentation is so complex that it required dedicated Nelsonians to thoroughly investigate the material in their own time and present it to engaged and concerned citizens. PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
3494	S830.003	Errol Shaw	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13

3495	S830.004	Errol Shaw	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The discrepancies between the Statistics NZ medium projections and the growth forecasts used by NCC are so different that the scale of intensification would not be required. [Refer to original submission for more detail.]	Reject	Section 10
3496	S830.006	Errol Shaw	Mapping	Oppose	Remove MDZ from the Brooke area [inferred].	If Plan 29 as proposed is to be implemented I understand that Brook Street residents could face a series of 12m building structures without notice emerging right next door to them. It is understandable that living in the Brooke is a valley environment in which Medium Density Zone buildings are alien to what is established as a successful harmonious mostly single storey housing. Aesthetically, any alien block-like structures will become visual and social blights on the local landscape and they will be identified as the developers' monuments who are not part of our community but as foreign invaders. [Refer to original submission for more detail.]	Reject	Section 12
3497	S830.010	Errol Shaw	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3498	S830.011	Errol Shaw	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 12
3499	FS28.063	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 in part	Section 12
3500	S830.013	Errol Shaw	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3501	S830.015	Errol Shaw	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Utilize qualified experts with strong community interests to provide insights into developing informative, practical and visionary [designs].	There are numerous qualified people who need to be considered. William Samuels of Willaim Samuels Architects provided excellent ideas regarding the vision of Nelson for the future and the importance of good design. Lindsay Woods, direct or Resilenz, could also be another contributor for a much needed rethink of the future for Nelson. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3502	S830.018	Errol Shaw	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S830.005 and S830.011.	Reject	Section 13
3503	S833.004	Marie Brodersow	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 S833.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3504	S833.006	Marie Brodersow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S833.001 and S833.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12

3505	S833.007	Marie Brodersow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3506	S833.008	Marie Brodersow	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3507	S834.004	Rosemary-Anne Gundry	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Delete the] High Density Residential Zone (HDZ), that has a max height greater than 12 m.	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 S834.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3508	S834.006	Rosemary-Anne Gundry	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S834.001 and S834.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3509	S834.007	Rosemary-Anne Gundry	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3510	S834.008	Rosemary-Anne Gundry	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the Closing Date for Submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3511	S835.002	Carol-Anne Armitage	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Be realistic about the number of people likely to move to Nelson as population growth must surely be in line with job or business opportunities that are likely to be available.	I have serious questions about the projected rate of population growth in Nelson. Refer to original submission for points drawn from media release by Nick Brunsdon on Infometrics and article from Robert MacCulloch. Nelson's main streams for economic growth are tourism and the hospitality sector. It doesn't have a lot of large Business /Industry employers. A high percentage of our young people move out of Nelson after leaving school for university, travel and/or job opportunities elsewhere. In addition, many in the 65+ age range, which is projected to be the fastest growing in the coming decade, will continue to choose to sell their larger houses to move into lifestyle/retirement villages which offer a good quality of life, security and frees them from ongoing repairs and maintenance costs for a large home that they no longer require. When the Unitary Plan Process first started Auckland was to provide for a projected increase of 1.2 million in population over 30 years. However, that number was revised down to well under 1 million. I would suggest that the projected population growth number for Nelson over 30 years could very likely be revised down. I am not convinced that modelling has got the figures right on expected population growth in Nelson.	Reject	Section 10
3512	FS83.237	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in submission and want NCC to learn from mistakes made in Auckland.	Reject	Section 12

3513	S836.001	Richard Te Tau	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Request that Council abandon PC29.	Mana, you may not do anything to effect my Mana and connection to my Whenua nor Te Atua (Gods) Tane Mahuta Atua O te Ngahere (God of the forest) Rongomatane Atua O te Rongo (God of Peace and Cultivated food) Rua Moko god of earth quakes Papatuanuku can't not stand imbalance on the earth... Earthquake shall come and destroy as a result Te whiti mi te Ra... the sun shall shine through this having come from creation and the seperation between Papatuanuku and Ranginui Te Reo Maori, our language comes from the children of Tane, Tui, Piwakawaka, weka... You may not interfere with Te Reo, Te Whenua, Te Ngahere. You may not create imbalance on the Whenua, this effecting Tane Mahuta and his children being Te Manu (Birds) and Te Ngahere (Forest) whom both need natural day light hours from Te Ra (the sun). You may not interfere with Tanemahuta and his right to photosynthesis. You may not interfere with Papatuanuku the earth mother and effect her water table in which she nurtures Tane mahuta. You may not divide neighbouring properties earth up lowering water concentration on my Whenua which nurtures Tanemahuta and Rongomatane (I have already been told by council staff this is ok?) You may not interfere with Rongomatane and the gifts of cultivated foods, this being the removal of Te Ra (Sun) and photosynthesis. Spending millions on trapping/ poisoning introduced species while the children of The Atua visiting my Whenua every day and belong on all Whenua are displaced by lack of sunshine and lack of healthy trees, cultivated foods if sunlight is interfered with. Knowing the history of Nelson and water restrictions going back many years and "climate change" Council does not have the right to let more development happen	Reject	Section 13
3514	S836.002	Richard Te Tau	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Request that all Council staffers and their families disclose all properties owned by themselves or trusts in which lands are held within [PC29 upzoned areas].	I also request that all Council staffers and their families disclose all properties owned by themselves or trusts in which lands are held within these "plan 29" areas. Let's see who really has to gain from this!	Reject	Section 13
3515	S837.004	Vernette Morris	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 S837.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3516	S837.006	Vernette Morris	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S837.001 and S837.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3517	S837.007	Vernette Morris	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3518	S837.008	Vernette Morris	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3519	S837.009	Vernette Morris	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Oppose] Plan Change 29.	I disagree whole heartedly to Plan Change 29 and the way it has been presented. There has been no community involvement and no design put foward as to how this will all look for Nelson. its an impact to these affected on the health and wellbeing loosing sunlight and privacy. Nelson projected growth does not warrant 6 storey constructions even 3 storeys is too much. Better use of land and construction with old state highway on Waimea Road.	Reject	Section 12
3520	S838.004	Angeline Johnston	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 S838.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3521	S838.006	Angeline Johnston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S838.001 and S838.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3522	S838.007	Angeline Johnston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13

3523	S838.008	Angeline Johnston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3524	S838.009	Angeline Johnston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Suggests] Semi rural areas to build upwards (storied apartments).	I disagree with this plan whole heartedly! I don't think residential streets are the right place to start building storied apartments. I certainly don't want to lose the sun or views that we have!! This plan will also de-value our homes, and make our quiet streets a lot busier. A big NO! I honestly don't know what the answer here is [in reference to 'suggestion for how Nelson could solve it's so called housing crisis'], but the people this will affect must have a voice in this!! There must be more suitable areas to build upwards, perhaps semi-rural?	Reject	Section 9
3525	S839.004	Norma Kaa	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 S838.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3526	S839.006	Norma Kaa	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S839.001 and S838.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3527	S839.007	Norma Kaa	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3528	S839.008	Norma Kaa	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3529	S841.004	Sandra Burke	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 S841.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3530	S841.006	Sandra Burke	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S841.001 and S841.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3531	S841.007	Sandra Burke	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3532	S841.008	Sandra Burke	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Not stated]	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3533	S841.009	Sandra Burke	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Opposes] 6 storey high apartment blocks in existing residential areas.	6 storey high apartment blocks should not be placed in existing residential areas. Focus on central city - to 4 storeys high. [The city] needs to be well planned, not rushed, research and understanding the needs of the community [otherwise] lose the character of Nelson.	Accept in part	Section 12
3534	S842.004	Lennane Kernt	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 S842.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3535	S842.006	Lennane Kernt	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S842.001 and S842.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3536	S842.007	Lennane Kernt	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3537	S842.008	Lennane Kernt	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3538	S842.009	Lennane Kernt	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	[supports] neighborhood plans with local input, or the outcome reflecting the different areas of Nelson.	Accessibility to the city should not be seen as such a priority. With the increase in bus services and cycleways - areas such as Nile Street with its old villas and ambience would not be seen as suitable for high density, high development.	Accept	Section 9
3539	S843.004	Diana Bowering	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 S843.001.	Accept in part	Section 12

3540	S843.006	Diana Bowering	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S843.001 and S843.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3541	S843.007	Diana Bowering	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3542	S843.008	Diana Bowering	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3543	S843.009	Diana Bowering	Entire Plan Change	Amend	[Amend] Plan Change 29 - develop new spatial neighborhood plan for all medium and high density zones.	Concern that there has been no city 'design' which could mean random developments in inappropriate places. We first need comprehensive neighborhood plans - which our current Future Development Strategy calls for anyway. Only then can we set the rules and development criteria. Do the easiest first - i.e. CBD fringe - there are plenty of car sale yards on suitable land and then there would be limited impact on suburban neighborhoods. Well designed cities do not happen by chance.	Accept in part	Section 12
3544	S844.001	Hamish Neill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons on submission point S844.002.	Reject	Section 13
3545	S844.002	Hamish Neill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3546	S844.003	Hamish Neill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3547	S844.004	Hamish Neill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
3548	S844.006	Hamish Neill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices. Preferably a joint agency with Tasman to ensure growth continues consistently across the Nelson area.	Refer to reasons in submission point S844.005. I have read and agree with the submission from NelsonTasman2050, and their proposal for a joint Nelson-Tasman Urban Development agency.	Reject	Section 13
3549	S844.010	Hamish Neill	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. Urban development needs to be managed carefully. Plan 29 does not do this. Nelson does not need buildings with 6 stories to cater for population growth, it needs a carefully planned strategy with LOW rise intensification. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12

3550	S844.011	Hamish Neill	Mapping	Oppose	Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district.	Pending such progressive expansion [as requested in submission point S844.019] all residential areas (beyond the CBD) should have the same rules of maximum building height of 8.5m, with an absolute height of 11m if resource consent is applied for and AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force. 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 12
3551	FS28.064	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 in part	Section 12
3552	S844.019	Hamish Neill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties and provided that it is developed under any Urban Development Plan which has been developed following appropriate consultation with the community.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3553	S844.027	Hamish Neill	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
3554	S844.030	Hamish Neill	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3555	S846.004	Suzanne Gibbons	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 S846.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3556	S846.006	Suzanne Gibbons	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S846.001 and S846.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3557	S846.007	Suzanne Gibbons	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13

3558	S846.008	Suzanne Gibbons	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3559	S847.004	Ian Faulkner	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 S847.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3560	S847.006	Ian Faulkner	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S847.001 and S847.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3561	S847.007	Ian Faulkner	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3562	S847.008	Ian Faulkner	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3563	S847.011	Ian Faulkner	Residential Zones	Not Stated	[Requests council] assess the number of houses being used as airbnbs.	Currently we have residents living in motels and tourists residing in houses.	Reject	Section 9
3564	S847.013	Ian Faulkner	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	[Requests] tiny home parks - either rent a section or purchase one to put a tiny home on.	This worked well in Tahuna camp ground although those houses are slightly bigger than a tiny home.	Reject	Section 13
3565	S848.004	S Buttner	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 S848.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3566	S848.006	S Buttner	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S848.001 and S848.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3567	S848.007	S Buttner	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3568	S848.008	S Buttner	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3569	S849.004	Margaret Trathen	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 S849.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3570	S849.006	Margaret Trathen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S849.001 and S849.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3571	S849.007	Margaret Trathen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3572	S849.008	Margaret Trathen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3573	S850.004	N Mace	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 S850.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3574	S850.006	N Mace	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S850.001 and S850.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3575	S850.007	N Mace	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3576	S850.008	N Mace	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13

3577	S851.004	Stephen Gundry	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 S851.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3578	S851.006	Stephen Gundry	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S851.001 and S851.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3579	S851.007	Stephen Gundry	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3580	S851.008	Stephen Gundry	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3581	S852.004	John Gibson	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 S852.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3582	S852.006	John Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S852.001 and S852.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3583	S852.007	John Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3584	S852.008	John Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3585	S853.004	Beverley Gibson	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 S853.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3586	S853.006	Beverley Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S853.001 and S853.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3587	S853.007	Beverley Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3588	S853.008	Beverley Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3589	S854.004	Craig Moore	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 S854.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3590	S854.006	Craig Moore	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S854.001 and S854.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3591	S854.007	Craig Moore	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3592	S854.008	Craig Moore	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3593	S855.004	Tracy Farrell and David Tyree	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 S855.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3594	S855.006	Tracy Farrell and David Tyree	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S855.001 and S855.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3595	S855.007	Tracy Farrell and David Tyree	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13

3596	S855.008	Tracy Farrell and David Tyree	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3597	S856.004	Pamela Goodin	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 S856.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3598	S856.006	Pamela Goodin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S856.001 and S856.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3599	S856.011	Pamela Goodin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S856.009 and S856.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3600	S857.004	Hubert Martin	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 S857.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3601	S857.006	Hubert Martin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S857.001 and S857.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3602	S857.011	Hubert Martin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S857.009 and S857.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3603	S858.004	Catherine Hughson	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. See reasons in submission point (1).	Accept in part	Section 12
3604	S858.006	Catherine Hughson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S858.001 and S858.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3605	S858.007	Catherine Hughson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3606	S858.008	Catherine Hughson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3607	S858.009	Catherine Hughson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Suggests] staged development of older areas particularly those already areas already providing social housing.	Staged development of older areas particularly those already areas already providing social housing. Large housing blocks orientated in a north/south aspect creating less light impact. requirement for higher blocks to back onto a street - not close to neighbors or industrials areas.	Reject	Section 10
3608	S858.012	Catherine Hughson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	[Seeks council consider and address] pressure on existing environments in terms of parking, reduced living space, noise creation, and pressure on existing natural envionments.	Poor planning leads to lack of basic infrastructure, services and contributing to social problems.	Reject	Section 11
3609	S859.004	Diane Varey	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 S859.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3610	S859.006	Diane Varey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S859.001 and S859.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12

3611	S859.011	Diane Varey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Reject plan change 29], but if it is not rejected, then I would like to request the changes [in submission points S859.009 and S859.010 above].	I 100% reject plan change 29 in its entirety.	Reject	Section 9
3612	S860.001	Noah Hosie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdrawal of the plan change by Council prior to calling for further submissions, and if not withdrawn, rejection (dismissal/cancellation) of the whole Plan Change 29 by the Commissioner and/or the Council.	The whole basis for the plan change (i.e. the expected increase in population) is false and Council did not rely sufficiently on Statistics NZ figures. There have been no neighbourhood meetings or consultation as recommended in the Future Development Strategy. I acknowledge that I have found it difficult (in fact impossible) to digest the total effect of the proposed PC29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages. I consider that some of the publicity coming out of Council (in relation to the plan change) has been positively misleading. I hope that more qualified citizens will make more comprehensive submissions covering my concerns as to the ongoing protection of existing views and access to sunlight for all residential occupiers, and absence of any encouragement to provide parking.	Reject	Section 9
3613	S860.012	Noah Hosie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Redraft the objectives and policies of the plan change to appropriately reflect all the [previous requests].	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3614	S860.013	Noah Hosie	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent panel (i.e. no present Councillors) to hear submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3615	S861.001	Wayne Pool	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons on submission point S861.002.	Reject	Section 13
3616	S861.002	Wayne Pool	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3617	S861.003	Wayne Pool	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3618	S861.004	Wayne Pool	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
3619	S861.006	Wayne Pool	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S861.005.	Reject	Section 13
3620	S861.010	Wayne Pool	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12

3621	S861.011	Wayne Pool	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 12
3622	FS28.065	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 in part	Section 12
3623	S861.013	Wayne Pool	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3624	S861.018	Wayne Pool	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S861.005 and S861.011.	Reject	Section 13
3625	S861.019	Wayne Pool	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3626	S861.027	Wayne Pool	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
3627	S861.029	Wayne Pool	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3628	S861.030	Wayne Pool	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3629	S862.004	Stephanie Strawbridge	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 S862.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3630	S862.006	Stephanie Strawbridge	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S862.001 and S862.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12

3631	S862.007	Stephanie Strawbridge	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3632	S862.008	Stephanie Strawbridge	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3633	S863.001	Carolyn Sygrove	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S863.002.	Reject	Section 13
3634	S863.002	Carolyn Sygrove	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3635	S863.003	Carolyn Sygrove	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint experts in urban and environmental design.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3636	S863.004	Carolyn Sygrove	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
3637	S863.006	Carolyn Sygrove	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S863.005.	Reject	Section 13
3638	S863.010	Carolyn Sygrove	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3639	S863.011	Carolyn Sygrove	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 12
3640	FS28.066	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 in part	Section 12
3641	S863.013	Carolyn Sygrove	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. Eg Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3642	S863.018	Carolyn Sygrove	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S863.005 and S863.011.	Reject	Section 13

3643	S863.019	Carolyn Sygrove	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties and new builds are designed to aesthetically complement the neighbouring house styles (refer to example of Tasman St apartments in original submission).	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before moving into the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3644	S863.027	Carolyn Sygrove	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
3645	S863.029	Carolyn Sygrove	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3646	S863.030	Carolyn Sygrove	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3647	S863.035	Carolyn Sygrove	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to provide schooling for the growing population as the schools are currently at capacity.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3648	S863.036	Carolyn Sygrove	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to provide extra GP clinics for the growing population as the GP surgeries are currently at capacity and consider the extra demand on hospital services for the growing population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3649	S863.037	Carolyn Sygrove	Mapping	Oppose	Provide an area for housing development to replace the forested hills, in which careful planning involves large scale native planting, communal gardens, outdoor space, appropriate housing types, and potentially multi-storey apartments built against the hill in a way that they do not shade each other.	I do not support greenfield developments when they take up prime horticultural or recreational land. However, we have a problem with large areas of forestry close to residential areas, e.g. The Brook and Maitai Valleys. Exotic forests cause erosion as they change the acidity of the soil which in turn prevents any type of native undergrowth which would provide moisture retention healthy PH soil. The dryness of exotic forests creates a huge fire risk as we have seen in recent years. Here in Seymore Avenue we were on the brink of evacuation when an arsonist started a fire above Iwa Road.	Reject	Section 12
3650	S864.001	Richard Savill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S864.002.	Reject	Section 13

3651	S864.002	Richard Savill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3652	S864.003	Richard Savill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint experts in urban and environmental design.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3653	S864.004	Richard Savill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
3654	S864.006	Richard Savill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S864.005.	Reject	Section 13
3655	S864.010	Richard Savill	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3656	S864.011	Richard Savill	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 12
3657	FS28.067	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 in part	Section 12
3658	S864.013	Richard Savill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3659	S864.018	Richard Savill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S864.005 and S864.011.	Reject	Section 13

3660	S864.019	Richard Savill	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties and new builds are designed to aesthetically complement the neighbouring house styles (refer to example of Tasman St apartments in original submission).	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before moving into the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3661	S864.027	Richard Savill	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
3662	S864.029	Richard Savill	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3663	S864.035	Richard Savill	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to provide schooling for the growing population as the schools are currently at capacity.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3664	S864.036	Richard Savill	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to provide extra GP clinics for the growing population as the GP surgeries are currently at capacity and consider the extra demand on hospital services for the growing population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3665	S864.037	Richard Savill	Mapping	Oppose	Provide an area for housing development to replace the forested hills, in which careful planning involves large scale native planting, communal gardens, outdoor space, appropriate housing types, and potentially multi-storey apartments built against the hill in a way that they do not shade each other.	I do not support greenfield developments when they take up prime horticultural or recreational land. However, we have a problem with large areas of forestry close to residential areas, e.g. The Brook and Maitai Valleys. Exotic forests cause erosion as they change the acidity of the soil which in turn prevents any type of native undergrowth which would provide moisture retention healthy PH soil. The dryness of exotic forests creates a huge fire risk as we have seen in recent years. Here in Seymore Avenue we were on the brink of evacuation when an arsonist started a fire above Iwa Road.	Reject	Section 12
3666	S865.004	John Molyneux	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 S865.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
3667	S865.006	John Molyneux	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S865.001 and S865.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
3668	S865.007	John Molyneux	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13

3669	S865.008	John Molyneux	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
3670	S866.001	Sarah Mitchell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S866.002.	Reject	Section 13
3671	S866.002	Sarah Mitchell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3672	S866.003	Sarah Mitchell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3673	S866.004	Sarah Mitchell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
3674	S866.006	Sarah Mitchell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S866.005.	Reject	Section 13
3675	S866.010	Sarah Mitchell	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3676	S866.011	Sarah Mitchell	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 12
3677	FS28.068	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 in part	Section 12
3678	S866.013	Sarah Mitchell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. Eg Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3679	S866.018	Sarah Mitchell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S866.005 and S866.011.	Reject	Section 13

3680	S866.019	Sarah Mitchell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3681	S866.027	Sarah Mitchell	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
3682	S866.029	Sarah Mitchell	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3683	S866.030	Sarah Mitchell	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3684	S867.001	Cameron Mitchell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S867.002.	Reject	Section 13
3685	S867.002	Cameron Mitchell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3686	S867.003	Cameron Mitchell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3687	S867.004	Cameron Mitchell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
3688	S867.006	Cameron Mitchell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S867.005.	Reject	Section 13
3689	S867.010	Cameron Mitchell	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12

3690	S867.011	Cameron Mitchell	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 12
3691	FS28.069	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 in part	Section 12
3692	S867.013	Cameron Mitchell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3693	S867.018	Cameron Mitchell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S867.005 and S867.011.	Reject	Section 13
3694	S867.019	Cameron Mitchell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3695	S867.027	Cameron Mitchell	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
3696	S867.029	Cameron Mitchell	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3697	S867.030	Cameron Mitchell	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3698	S868.001	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S868.002.	Reject	Section 13

3699	S868.002	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions. Provide an opportunity for LOCAL building / landscape architects to input.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail.] Plan Change 29 was sprung on people and difficult in parts to understand. There are many ordinary people who would like to submit but who are not qualified, have the expertise, knowledge or confidence to do this. Refer to original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 13
3700	S868.003	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3701	S868.004	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ. There is many empty housing in Nelson sitting empty - why? Where is the data re housing demand to justify this plan?	Reject	Section 10
3702	S868.006	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S868.005. Do not want to see intensification and development controlled by Kainga Ora, Developers, Iwi and other landowners.	Reject	Section 13
3703	S868.010	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail] Intensive housing leads to all softs of social issues... noise, loss of privacy, health, Covid and recurring viruses are here to stay and close living has been proven to be detrimental.	Accept	Section 12
3704	S868.011	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	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 12
3705	FS28.070	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 in part	Section 12
3706	S868.013	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13

3707	S868.018	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S868.005 and S868.011.	Reject	Section 13
3708	S868.019	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3709	S868.027	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	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
3710	S868.030	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3711	S868.031	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Infrastructure	Oppose	Infrastructure and roads need attention first	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3712	S868.032	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Put a height limit on all buildings [and] no buildings on the ridgelines.	We need to keep views of surrounds, hills, sea, etc. and not be blocked.	Reject	Section 9
3713	S868.033	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider [rules regarding] lighting (the night sky).	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3714	S868.035	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	{Apply} a height limit to all buildings.	Refer to the reasons in S868.007 and other related reasons in the submission.	Accept	Section 12
3715	S870.001	Sara Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S870.002.	Reject	Section 13
3716	S870.002	Sara Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3717	S870.003	Sara Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13

3718	S870.004	Sara Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
3719	S870.006	Sara Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S870.005.	Reject	Section 13
3720	S870.010	Sara Cooper	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3721	S870.011	Sara Cooper	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 12
3722	FS28.071	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 in part	Section 12
3723	S870.013	Sara Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3724	S870.018	Sara Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S870.005 and S870.011.	Reject	Section 13
3725	S870.019	Sara Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3726	S870.027	Sara Cooper	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

3727	S870.029	Sara Cooper	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3728	S870.030	Sara Cooper	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3729	S871.001	Garry Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the 'Emotional Summary' in the original submission for more detail. Refer to reasons in submission point S871.002.	Reject	Section 13
3730	S871.002	Garry Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3731	S871.003	Garry Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3732	S871.004	Garry Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
3733	S871.005	Garry Cooper	Heritage	Oppose	Create a broader level of protection for neighbourhoods beyond the heritage buildings and precincts that still have historic character value from the early settlement years of Nelson.	Nelson is a very special and unique place that needs to be protected with care. It is unlike any other district in NZ. It includes a 'Low Rise' City with a collection of heritage and non-heritage character buildings that have attracted people for generations and been a cherished holiday destination for many New Zealanders. Residential neighbourhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy and new developments thoughtfully designed and planned on a neighbourhood, by neighbourhood basis to maintain the essence of their character. Green Spaces, Trees and Landscaping are essential for the look and feel of some of our older neighbourhoods. They help considerably with the wellbeing of the residents and help to provide an essential part of the attraction of Nelson, which must all be considered during developing the growth of Nelson. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
3734	FS65.427	Heritage Nelson		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission we support is: Create a broader level of protection for neighbourhoods beyond the heritage buildings and precincts that still have historic character value from the early settlement years of Nelson. 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 in part	Section 12

3735	FS78.412	Sarah Holman		Support	Accept	The particular part of the submission I support is: Create a broader level of protection for neighbourhoods beyond the heritage buildings and precincts that still have historic character value from the early settlement years of 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. It has been undertaken by one person rather than a multidisciplinary team.	Reject	Section 13
3736	S871.006	Garry Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S871.005.	Reject	Section 13
3737	S871.010	Garry Cooper	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3738	S871.011	Garry Cooper	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 12
3739	FS28.072	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 in part	Section 12
3740	S871.013	Garry Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3741	S871.018	Garry Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S871.005 and S871.011.	Reject	Section 13
3742	S871.019	Garry Cooper	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10

3743	S871.029	Garry Cooper	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3744	S871.030	Garry Cooper	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3745	S872.001	Amanda Young	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Reject Plan Change 29.	The proposed Plan Change 29 will greatly reduce the amenity, character and liveability of Nelson. The proposed Plan Change 29 will reduce and/or remove many of the qualities of the Inner City that are of competitive advantage and economic benefit, for example, the small scale of the buildings, the character and boutique feel of the inner shopping area, the heritage buildings and structures, the trees. The adverse effects of Plan Change 29 on existing residents will greatly outweigh the postulated benefits, for example, loss of amenity, sunlight. I agree that some intensification is needed and desirable but I do not believe that the city wide degree of intensification proposed by Plan Change 29 is warranted. I do not believe that the projected population growth used by Nelson City Council is correct. I support the intent of Plan Change 29 for intensification rather than greenfield development. I support the intent of Plan Change 29 to encourage inner city living. I oppose all the proposed zones, rules and regulations within Plan Change 29. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
3746	FS83.241	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 12
3747	S872.002	Amanda Young	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Design neighbourhood plans in conjunction with residents and appropriate experts (such as urban designers, architects, heritage experts) to provide for some intensification without adverse effects on existing character, amenity, heritage, and existing residents.	I believe that there are better ways to cater for growth and provide for necessary future housing, for example, use of neighbourhood plans; lower scale of development; encouragement of heritage building reuse and adaption (for example, in the inner city for residential accommodation) and more use of low scale "granny flats', tiny houses etc. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3748	FS83.242	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 12
3749	S872.003	Amanda Young	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	If Plan Change 29 does go ahead, I submit that all new developments, across all zones, require robust urban design input as a rule rather than a recommendation.	There needs to be good urban and architectural design with each development carefully considered and controlled to ensure few adverse effects on existing residents, heritage, the environment and the character of the city. The overall development of each neighbourhood should be carefully planned rather than allowed to develop piece-meal by developers and individuals. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3750	FS83.243	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 12
3751	S872.005	Amanda Young	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	If plan change 29 does go ahead, remove the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Refer to reasons in submission points S872.001 to 872.003.	Accept in part	Section 12
3752	FS83.245	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 12
3753	S873.001	Vincent Riepen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S873.002.	Reject	Section 13
3754	FS83.257	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 12

3755	S873.002	Vincent Riepen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	No accountability for creating poorer health outcomes for affected parties where reduced amenity values of their homes through increased shadowing, loss of sunshine, views and privacy. No financial compensation to the affected resident's adversely effected by implementing PC 29. The severe lack of Trust between residents and Council has become significant. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3756	FS83.258	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 12
3757	S873.003	Vincent Riepen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3758	FS83.259	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 12
3759	S873.004	Vincent Riepen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
3760	FS83.260	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 12
3761	S873.006	Vincent Riepen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S873.005.	Reject	Section 13
3762	FS83.262	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 12
3763	S873.010	Vincent Riepen	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3764	FS83.266	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 12
3765	S873.011	Vincent Riepen	Mapping	Oppose	Apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district.	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.	Reject	Section 12
3766	FS28.073	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 in part	Section 12
3767	FS83.267	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 12
3768	S873.013	Vincent Riepen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13

3770	S873.018	Vincent Riepen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S873.005 and S873.011.	Reject	Section 13
3771	FS83.311	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 12
3772	S873.027	Vincent Riepen	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
3773	FS83.316	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 12
3774	S873.029	Vincent Riepen	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3775	FS83.269	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 12
3776	S873.030	Vincent Riepen	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3777	FS83.270	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 12
3778	S874.001	Ingrid Weeks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S874.002.	Reject	Section 13
3779	S874.002	Ingrid Weeks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3780	S874.006	Ingrid Weeks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S864.005.	Reject	Section 13
3781	S874.010	Ingrid Weeks	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3782	S874.011	Ingrid Weeks	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 12

3783	FS28.074	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 in part	Section 12
3784	S874.013	Ingrid Weeks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3785	S874.018	Ingrid Weeks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S864.005 and S864.011.	Reject	Section 13
3786	S874.019	Ingrid Weeks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3787	S874.027	Ingrid Weeks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seeks council ensure] social housing be low cost and humble, meeting basic requirements yet incentivizing people to work towards home ownership.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3788	S874.029	Ingrid Weeks	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3789	S874.030	Ingrid Weeks	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3790	S875.001	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons on submission point S875.002.	Reject	Section 13
3791	S875.002	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3792	S875.006	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S875.005.	Reject	Section 13

3793	S875.010	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3794	S875.011	Terry and Anna Rodgers	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 12
3795	FS28.075	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 in part	Section 12
3796	S875.013	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3797	S875.018	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S875.005 and S875.011.	Reject	Section 13
3798	S875.019	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3799	S875.027	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seeks council ensure] social housing be low cost and humble, meeting basic requirements yet incentivising people to work towards home ownership.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13
3800	S875.029	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3801	S875.030	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3802	S876.001	Brian Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S876.002.	Reject	Section 13

3803	S876.002	Brian Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3804	S876.006	Brian Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S876.005.	Reject	Section 13
3805	S876.010	Brian Rodgers	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3806	S876.011	Brian Rodgers	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 12
3807	FS28.076	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 in part	Section 12
3808	S876.013	Brian Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3809	S876.018	Brian Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S876.005 and S876.011.	Reject	Section 13
3810	S876.019	Brian Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3811	S876.027	Brian Rodgers	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Seeks council ensure] social housing be low cost and humble, meeting basic requirements yet incentivising people to work towards home ownership.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 13

3812	S876.029	Brian Rodgers	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3813	S876.030	Brian Rodgers	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3814	S877.001	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons on submission point S877.002. PC29 appears to be a hastily-compiled collection of kite-flying suggestions, not well-thought-out enough to qualify as a plan yet alarming in its general direction of intensification at all costs and abandonment of decades of careful law-making, forward-looking conservation processes and preservation of Nelson's history.	Reject	Section 9
3815	S877.002	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3816	S877.003	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3817	S877.004	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
3818	S877.006	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S877.005.	Reject	Section 13
3819	S877.010	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3820	S877.011	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	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 12

3821	FS28.077	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 in part	Section 12
3822	S877.013	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3823	S877.018	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S877.005 and S877.011	Reject	Section 13
3824	S877.019	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3825	S877.027	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	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
3826	S877.029	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3827	S877.030	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

3828	S878.001	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw PC 29 and undertake community engagement.	The process has been deficient and unacceptable by not going out for community consultation. I feel aggrieved that I have had to read the masses of documents and submit on this PPC29 when I should have been spending time with my family. NCC had a chance to withdraw PPC29 and instead consult on it as a draft. Councillor Courtney put forward a motion which could have halted this submission process. His comments represented the voices of Nelson residents. At that point in time, PPC29 could have been withdrawn and changed to a draft plan going out for community engagement and consultation. I believe that decision to proceed with the motion (above) was disrespectful to all Nelson residents. Our NCC councillors have neglected their duty of care to plan adequately and consult with the community, and instead they have placed the onus on every single resident of Nelson to research and read the many documents needed to put forward a submission; an unnecessary stress and pressure on each of us. The time frame has been too compressed, considering 'Plan Change 29 is the biggest plan change that we have done as a Council in a generation' (Our Nelson, issue 176). [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
3829	S878.002	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency.	Appoint an Urban Development Agency as suggested by the Nelson Tasman 2050 proposal. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3830	S878.003	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prepare a Social Impact Assessment.	There has been no social impact assessment completed for the PC29. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3831	S878.004	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Make infill housing a viable option.	Infill housing should be permitted subject to the current resource consent process and daylight angles. Are there ways to keep the cost down to make this a more attractive option to residents?	Accept in part	Section 12
3832	S878.005	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Regulate Airbnb's to be in similar category as Motels.	We have got [whole house] Airbnbs being used for people visiting, and motels being used for Nelson locals to live in. These houses need to return to the private rental market. This issue also adds to the problem we have in Nelson. NCC need to get tough and these Airbnb operators should be under the same rules as Motels, this has become an unregulated environment. Airbnb's should be liable for commercial rates, commercial insurances, inspections for a building warrant of fitness, just the same as Motels. This problem needs to be addressed and resolved and will go some way toward helping our rental shortage.	Reject	Section 9
3833	S878.006	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Assess higher density in the City Centre and assess individual sites that would allow multi-storey buildings without compromising neighbouring daylight angles.	I have no problem with slightly higher density in the inner city and inner city fringe. This is where the higher density design should start.	Accept	Section 9
3834	S878.008	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	After community consultation, the new PC 29 should go out to the public for submissions [and] all paperwork [should] be readily available for viewing by any resident of Nelson.	Key documents were not available to all Nelson residents and some vital information only available online. The online information was hard to find and there were many pages to read and review in the original 28 days, later extended to a 60 day timeframe.	Reject	Section 13

3835	S878.009	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent panel of 5 commissioners.	The commissioners assigned are not impartial or independent and in so appointing, NCC are breaching the rights of Nelson residents to be heard in a fair, just and unbiased tribunal. I am concerned the commissioners chosen are not independent. Both commissioners have already formed preliminary opinions and by voting on the motion (above) their position already shows their bias and proves they have a clear conflict of interest. The Mayor has repeatedly stated that local knowledge is important on a Hearing Panel to get the best outcome, but how can we know that they are open minded when they have already publicly declared their views. It is more important that the Commissioners are impartial with the experience and training needed to listen to all submissions without bias. For a matter of such importance it behoves NCC to do the right thing and appoint a panel of independent commissioners. The Christchurch City Council is going through this process and and they have elected to have an independent hearing panel of 5. I would like NCC to do the same. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3836	S878.010	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Utilise the] correct population growth statistics.	NCC has been providing misleading or exaggerated information on the future population growth. Why is NCC using projections that do not align with Statistics New Zealand and are forecast as higher? What is the reasoning? How can NCC choose to depart from using Statistics New Zealand data, exaggerate the data, and then build a 'biggest plan change that we have done as a Council in a generation' around it. I can not see the logic in NCC projections. PPC29 is based on inflated 'in house' projections. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3837	S878.012	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Stay within tier 2 responsibilities and enable at least sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand.	NCC are imposing Tier 1 local authority MDRS density standards into their resource management plans but, Nelson is a Tier 2 local authority, so the density standards are not required to be applied to the Nelson region. NCC are going beyond what is asked of a Tier 2 council As Tier 2, we need to enable sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 8
3838	S878.014	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the HDZ zoning from Tahunanui Hill.	High density and medium density on Tamaki Street hillside makes no sense. There is no bus service, there are no shops or amenities close by, and pedestrians will be forced to cross a busy main road and there has been slippage all along that hillside. Tahunanui hill needs to remain a general residential zone.	Accept	Section 12
3839	FS61.084	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- High density and medium density on Tamaki Street hillside makes no sense. There is no bus service, there are no shops or amenities close by, and pedestrians will be forced to cross a busy main road and there has been slippage all along that hillside. Tahunanui hill needs to remain a general residential zone. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Tahunanui hills should remain GDZ , remove both HDZ and MDZ from plan.	Accept in part	Section 12
3840	FS72.088	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- High density and medium density on Tamaki Street hillside makes no sense. There is no bus service, there are no shops or amenities close by, and pedestrians will be forced to cross a busy main road and there has been slippage all along that hillside. Tahunanui hill needs to remain a general residential zone. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Tahunanui hills should remain GDZ , remove both HDZ and MDZ from plan.	Accept in part	Section 12

3841	FS60.080	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- High density and medium density on Tamaki Street hillside makes no sense. There is no bus service, there are no shops or amenities close by, and pedestrians will be forced to cross a busy main road and there has been slippage all along that hillside. Tahunanui hill needs to remain a general residential zone. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Tahunanui hills should remain GDZ , remove both HDZ and MDZ from plan.	Accept in part	Section 12
3842	S878.015	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the MDZ zoning from Tahunanui Hill.	Refer to reasons in submission point S878.014.	Accept in part	Section 12
3843	FS61.085	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- High density and medium density on Tamaki Street hillside makes no sense. There is no bus service, there are no shops or amenities close by, and pedestrians will be forced to cross a busy main road and there has been slippage all along that hillside. Tahunanui hill needs to remain a general residential zone. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Tahunanui hills should remain GDZ , remove both HDZ and MDZ from plan.	Accept in part	Section 12
3844	FS72.089	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- High density and medium density on Tamaki Street hillside makes no sense. There is no bus service, there are no shops or amenities close by, and pedestrians will be forced to cross a busy main road and there has been slippage all along that hillside. Tahunanui hill needs to remain a general residential zone. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Tahunanui hills should remain GDZ , remove both HDZ and MDZ from plan.	Accept in part	Section 12
3845	FS60.081	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- High density and medium density on Tamaki Street hillside makes no sense. There is no bus service, there are no shops or amenities close by, and pedestrians will be forced to cross a busy main road and there has been slippage all along that hillside. Tahunanui hill needs to remain a general residential zone. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Tahunanui hills should remain GDZ , remove both HDZ and MDZ from plan.	Accept in part	Section 12
3846	S878.016	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Mapping	Oppose	Apply the General Residential Zone to Tahunanui Hill.	Refer to reasons in submission point S878.014.	Accept	Section 12
3847	FS61.086	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- High density and medium density on Tamaki Street hillside makes no sense. There is no bus service, there are no shops or amenities close by, and pedestrians will be forced to cross a busy main road and there has been slippage all along that hillside. Tahunanui hill needs to remain a general residential zone. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Tahunanui hills should remain GDZ , remove both HDZ and MDZ from plan.	Accept in part	Section 12
3848	FS72.090	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- High density and medium density on Tamaki Street hillside makes no sense. There is no bus service, there are no shops or amenities close by, and pedestrians will be forced to cross a busy main road and there has been slippage all along that hillside. Tahunanui hill needs to remain a general residential zone. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Tahunanui hills should remain GDZ , remove both HDZ and MDZ from plan.	Accept in part	Section 12

3849	FS60.082	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- High density and medium density on Tamaki Street hillside makes no sense. There is no bus service, there are no shops or amenities close by, and pedestrians will be forced to cross a busy main road and there has been slippage all along that hillside. Tahunanui hill needs to remain a general residential zone. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- Tahunanui hills should remain GDZ , remove both HDZ and MDZ from plan.	Accept in part	Section 12
3850	S878.019	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject [these proposed sections of PC29].	Chapter 2 Meaning of words MW.iii Definitions Urban Zone means one or more of the Residential Zone, General Residential Zone, Medium Residential Zone, High Density Zone, Inner City Zone, Suburban Commercial Zone, Industrial Zone or any part of the Open Space and Recreation Zone that is surrounded by one or more of these zones. Taonga means (in relation to papakāinga in the General, Medium Density and High Density Residential zones, Inner City and Suburban Commercial zones) treasure, property. Taonga are prized and protected as sacred possessions of the tribe. Tipuna / tupuna means (in relation to papakāinga in the General, Medium Density and High Density Residential zones, Inner City and Suburban Commercial zones) ancestors. I oppose the addition of general, medium and high density zones.	Accept in part	Section 12
3851	S878.020	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Reject [the proposed] addition of general, medium and high density zones [in this section].	Chapter 3 administration AD11.2 Descriptions of zones and areas Residential Zone Lower Density Area Comprehensive Area Standard Area General Residential Zone Medium Density Residential Zone High Density Residential Zone Rural Zone Lower Density Small Holdings Area Higher Density Small Holdings Area Inner City Zone City Centre City Fringe Suburban Commercial Zone Leisure Area Industrial Zone Tahunanui Area Port Area Nayland Road South Area Saxtons Area Airport Area I oppose the addition of general, medium and high density zones.	Accept in part	Section 12
3852	S878.021	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject [the proposed] addition of general, medium and high density zones [in these sections].	Chapter 5 District wide objectives and policies DO1.1.1.ii oppose change in zonings. DO1.1.3.ii oppose change in zonings. DO1A in entirety. DO2.2 in entirety. I oppose the addition of general, medium and high density zones.	Accept in part	Section 12
3853	S878.022	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject removal [of these sections].	DO13A.3.1.iv NCC Urban Design panel - why remove, that is exactly what the City needs. Nelson Tasman 2050 have offered a proposal for a joint Nelson - Tasman Urban Development Agency. DO13A.6.2.vi As above. I like the idea of having a joint Nelson -Tasman Urban Development Agency that is independent from council.	Reject	Section 13
3854	S878.023	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Amend to include ajoint Nelson-Tasman UrbanDevelopmentAgency.	DO13A.6.3.v As [in submission point S878.022]. I like the idea of having a joint Nelson-Tasman Urban Development Agency that is independent from council. Council staff can help facilitate.	Reject	Section 13
3855	FS73.131	EQC Toka Tū Ake		Oppose in part	Accept in part	The submitter (Ryman Healthcare Limited) has requested separate rules for "ICr.37E Retirement Village" for the section, "Matters of Discretion are limited to: ... Mitigation measures to address risk from any flood or inundation hazards...". "Mitigation measures to address risk from any flood or inundation hazards" does not encompass natural hazard risk which cannot be mitigated and must be avoided, nor does it include risk from other natural hazards. This is of particular concern because retirement villages are an activity of high vulnerability and therefore require high levels of protection and management from natural hazards. As such we request that the submission only be allowed if "Mitigation measures to address risk from any flood or inundation hazards" is replaced as a matter of discretion by "Risk to residents, staff, and property from natural hazards".	Reject	Section 13

3856	S878.024	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject as enablingreduced amenity ofneighbouringproperties.	DO14.2.i 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.	Reject	Section 13
3857	S878.025	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject [these proposed sections of PC29].	DO15.1 Urban form urban zone boundaries referenced. DO16.1.1.i - DO16.1.1.vii Residential Zone I oppose the new zones. DO16.1.1.xxi reference the changed zoning. DO16.1.1.xxii reference zones on planning maps.	Accept in part	Section 12
3858	S878.027	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject and Oppose all until zoning is re-addressed with community consultation.	RE1 living style Oppose all as a lot of detail and includes the zoning changes.	Reject	Section 12
3859	S878.030	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject and oppose as submitted in opposition to PPC30.	Chapter 11 Open Space and Recreation Zone OSr.53 - OSr.54 Airport Effects Control Overlay Oppose all OSr.53 and OSr.54 as also opposed and rejected plan 30 and therefore reject this provision under PPC30 submission.	Accept in part	Section 12
3860	FS28.156	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose	Reject	The particular part of the submission we oppose is: Chapter 11 Open Space and Recreation Zone OSr.53 - OSr.54 Airport Effects Control Overlay. Oppose all OSr.53 and OSr.54 as also opposed and rejected plan 30 and therefore reject this provision under PPC30 submission. Rules OSr.53 - OSr.54 serve an important function to help control and manage the effects of residential activities e.g. density and acoustic insulation, where they are located within the Nelson Airport Overlays.	Reject	Section 12
3861	S878.031	Melinda and Craig Harvey	Residential Zones	Oppose	Reject [the proposed] addition of general, medium and high density zones [in these sections].	Appendix 15 daylight admission (residential) AP15.ii The daylight controls for the General Residential Zone, Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone are specified in Chapter 7 - Residential Rules. Where is Chapter 7 as mentioned on this online version? AP15.2 The daylight controls set out in this appendix do not apply to the General Residential Zone, Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone. Daylight controls are included in Chapter 7 - Residential Rules for the General Residential Zone, Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone. Mention of Chapter 7 - Residential rules and mention of the new zones which I oppose as they stand. I oppose the addition of general, medium and high density zones.	Accept in part	Section 12
3862	S879.001	Tasman District Council	Entire Plan Change	Support	Confirm the plan change, subject to the amendments set out in the submission.	Overall, Tasman supports the intent and general direction of PC29, but requests a range of amendments as set out in the submission.	Accept in part	Section 12
3863	FS18.002	Rodney Albertyn, Principal Planner, NZ Transport Agency		Support	Accept	NZTA supports the requirement for acoustic insulation for state highway noise. NZTA has however sought some changes to the extent of the noise overlay based on technical input provided after the plan change was notified.	Reject	Section 9

3864	S879.002	Tasman District Council	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	[Undertake] both a commercial feasibility and realistically expected to be realised capacity review of the plan enabled capacity from PC29, in order to ascertain the likely (i.e realistic) yield of PC29.	This will then enable a more realistic forecast of capacity to permit monitoring of the implementation of the Nelson Tasman FDS. It will also enable TDC to complete the 2024 Housing and Business Assessment jointly with NCC once a clearer picture of capacity is provided. This assessment is for Government and forms part of Councils' LTPs 2024-2034. Feasible and realistically expected to be realised housing capacity - s.32 report page 43 explains that under scenario 3 total capacity of the plan change amounts to 5-9 times the level of long term demand. Long term demand being 8,000 houses. The Market Economics report suggests that their model calculates the net additional dwellings theoretically enabled under the proposed planning provisions. The s,32 evaluation explains that scenario 3 of the model is the option that most closely reflects PC29 as notified. Scenario 3 concludes PC29 will provide capacity for 61,200 dwellings, of which 60,200 are from infill and redevelopment and 1,000 from greenfield. Such a yield is more than double the existing housing stock in Nelson, which is approximately 23,000 dwellings according to the Market Economics report. The extent of constraints analysis undertaken for the yield model is unclear, other than it has not considered commercial feasibility or realistically expected to be realised capacity. It is suggested that sites with geotech issues have been excluded. Have sites used for schools, reserves or other community infrastructure been excluded? Have land parcels below say 400 sq m been excluded? Have sites that have already been redeveloped recently been excluded? It is not clear how the capacity of the proposed zoned areas in PC29 relate to the capacity proposed in the Nelson Tasman Future Development	Reject	Section 10
3865	FS14.001	Hamish and Jane Grenfell		Support in part	Accept in part	We support the Tasman District Council's submission to undertake additional Housing Capacity Modelling to determine the feasible and infrastructure ready housing capacity available within the Nelson District. The Nelson City Council relies on the NPS-UD to justify their intensive zoning provisions. The Housing Capacity Assessment forms the basis of whether the full extent housing provided within PC29 is required. Submission S605 submits that a reduced proposal may also meet the housing capacity requirements (and therefore policy direction) within the NPS-UD. Submitter S605 therefore wishes to secure their position to be involved in any developments associated with a revised Housing Capapcity Model.	Reject	Section 9
3866	FS56.129	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Neutral	Not stated	Kāinga Ora takes a neutral view on this submission point but more broadly supports intensification in Nelson to address the housing shortfall.	Accept in part	Section 13
3867	S880.001	Master Christopher Geen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	Refer to reasons in submission point S880.002.	Reject	Section 13
3868	S880.002	Master Christopher Geen	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3869	S882.001	Ainslie Riddoch	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[PC 29] needs further consideration by both Council and residents to achieve [the best] result.	I reject Plan 29 in its current form because I do not believe it takes into account individual area characteristics and risks and should be designed for smaller individual areas taking into account the particularities of localities. I consider that this Plan change is of such great importance to our City and its residents that it needs further consideration by both Council and residents to achieve a result that ensures our City goes into the future in the best possible way without ad hoc inappropriate development.	Reject	Section 12

3870	S884.001	CCKV Maitahi Dev Co LP and Bayview Nelson Limited	Entire Plan Change	Neutral	Fully rectify any direct impacts on Private Plan Change 28.	Over the course of the last 3-4 years the proponents of PC28 have invested significantly into this private plan change for the benefit of the Nelson community. The positive recommendation from the Independent Commissioners fully endorsed this Plan Change and highlighted the wide-ranging benefits, along with confirming how that proposal achieves the key provisions of the NPS-UD along with the numerous other planning instruments. That recommendation was adopted by Council and the decision to approve PC28 is now Council's decision which is now defending in the Environment Court. The proponents of PC28 have only been able to review the provisions making up PC29 at the same time as the general public. The Council has however advised that PC28 is in no way affected by PC29 in that the site is outside of the scope of the changes proposed by PC29. In essence, the PC28 land is 'ringfenced'. In addition, a word search on the Section 32 Evaluation Report supporting PC29 will not identify any reference to PC28 whatsoever. Given the scope of PC29, with changes affecting most zone chapters, it is difficult to conceive that no part of the PC28 nor the planning framework that surrounds it (including Schedule X) is not affected in some way. The purpose of this email is to simply register the significant interests that the submitters have in the NRMP and the provisions related to PC28.	Reject	Section 9
3871	S885.001	Robert Stevenson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S885.002.	Reject	Section 13
3872	FS20.011	Tim Bayley		Support	Accept	Plan 29 needs to back to the drawing board ... start again ... ask the people first before planners and councillors try to enforce their ideal on the residents ... remember you work for the city .... that is us residents !	Reject	Section 13
3873	S885.002	Robert Stevenson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3874	S885.003	Robert Stevenson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3875	S885.004	Robert Stevenson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
3876	S885.006	Robert Stevenson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S885.005	Reject	Section 13
3877	S885.010	Robert Stevenson	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12

3878	S885.011	Robert Stevenson	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 12
3879	FS28.078	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 in part	Section 12
3880	S885.013	Robert Stevenson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. Eg Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3881	S885.018	Robert Stevenson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S885.005 and S885.011.	Reject	Section 13
3882	S885.019	Robert Stevenson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10

3883	S885.027	Robert Stevenson	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. Nelson needs to have more social and low-cost housing and importantly it needs to be carefully considered how this is achieved. By shoe horning blocks of apartments in amongst Nelsons CBD businesses or in established fringe City residential or near industrial land will result in poor outcomes. Better outcomes will be achieved by having no more than 10 low cost apartments together spread throughout suburbs, so clusters of intensified residential units are avoided. This will achieve better social outcomes for all residents. We only have to look at Franklin Hall, and areas of emergency housing in Rotorua, and Auckland Central. See attached Kate Hawksby Article from the NZ Herald [attached to original submission]. The worst thing that the NCC have done is to agree sell CBD land to Kianga Ora for Social Housing, which is undoubtedly NZ's worst landlord, being as they property set the lowest standard in Property Management, tenant behavior, with their properties are continuously plagued by crime and general anti-social behavior If the planned developments proceed would have a knock-on effect of discouraging further demand for inner city living if Nelson becomes known as a place of crime, making it unsafe to visit. In the last Councils hast to provided more social and low-cost housing these	Reject	Section 13
3884	S885.029	Robert Stevenson	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3885	S885.030	Robert Stevenson	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3886	S885.031	Robert Stevenson	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Provide a] Social Impact report to determine what type of Apartments will be in demand.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3887	S886.001	Tina Hanrahan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Ensure the numbers and statistics the council are using are relevant and the future projection models warrant this is not too much too soon. Keep it local to Nelson - not overseas modelling. Use of relevant NZ data.	I would like to start by saying I recognise there is an urgent need to address the housing crisis and wellbeing crisis we have in Nelson and New Zealand. It's a complex topic and raises many concerns and issues so is multi-faceted. We all want a better outlook for our future generations. Agree that there is a need to address the housing in New Zealand. To look further into: Transparency with the number's facts and figures.	Reject	Section 10
3888	S886.002	Tina Hanrahan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Look further into: Our future generations and our people to consider a clearer outline of the PC29 proposal, to ensure the process is addressing the needs of first time buyers, family housing, long term home, retirement and downsizing, and renters.	There is little point aiming for affordable housing in the city centre that is unattainable for the people the plan is aimed at, or the design doesn't meet.	Reject	Section 9
3889	S886.003	Tina Hanrahan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Allow] more time for public engagement and involvement.	The speed at which the public consultation process has been done to date is very quick. Not enough engagement and time to respond to such a large proposal. To do justice to the design more time for public engagement and involvement should be allowed.	Reject	Section 13

3890	S886.005	Tina Hanrahan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Prioritise] the wellbeing and wellness of the people [through a design approach] that considers all aspects of wellbeing and creates a vibrant centre.	The environment - Smart city vs Bio-urbanism Nelson is in a superb position to take a route that is trailblazing - a leader of design and honouring the environment. Has the council explored leading with a 'Bio-urban' approach rather than 'smart city'? Why? Nelson could be a frontrunner in the country and world as an organic, sustainable inspiring city. Nelson is small enough to use the natural environment as a whole part of the design not just greenery signalling (biophilic design & bio-urbanism). As a sunshine city - the light in the city and in apartments, homes and gardens is what sets the city apart. It is at the core of the wellness and wellbeing of the people who live here. The intensification of the city should uphold the wellbeing and wellness of the people and be at the forefront of the design. Inspirational design led approach which nurtures the assets of the city - bringing together inner city living to create a more vibrant centre, and the wider community which considers all aspects of wellbeing from sunlight, gardens, greenspace, good local food, produce, water, and nature.	Reject	Section 13
3891	S886.006	Tina Hanrahan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Research and apply ideas from overseas that are suitable to Nelson [inferred].	There are many examples of mistakes and positive outcomes in intensification nationally and overseas. There are many apartment blocks that had great intensions by design but have created unsafe, unhealthy, ghettos in public housing council blocks. Learn from overseas issues created. Cities that work - extrude the whys and apply to Nelson ideas for future talks. Refer to photos in original submission demonstrating opportunities to learn from overseas.	Reject	Section 4
3892	S886.007	Tina Hanrahan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[More] careful planning of [building] height and height restrictions.	Creating vibrancy and life to the city in a time when the city is struggling can work hand in hand with bringing more living into the city centre. Attracting people to the city to spend time there, live there, connect with work and after work life. The proposed changes to height restrictions are major changes which could hugely impact the light of the city and streetscapes just as the intensification of the townhouses which could be built around the city streets. Careful planning of height and height restrictions need to be clear, transparent and well understood before the next step.	Accept in part	Section 13
3893	S886.008	Tina Hanrahan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Engage local designers; [ensure] street appeal [and that new development] fits in; address the concept of placement, character, and interaction with the street and local environment; [balance] form and function, costs and quality.	A design led city as opposed to developer led would give greater opportunities to ensure sensitivity to the planning, and the character of place comes first rather than 'formula' approach.	Reject	Section 13
3894	S886.011	Tina Hanrahan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Maintain] a balance of green spaces in the city.	The environment - value of space - both in the city and wider community. A balance of green spaces in the city with the buildings. Outlook, and connection to nature all contribute to wellbeing and mental health.	Reject	Section 11
3895	S886.012	Tina Hanrahan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Ensure built form is of an appropriate scale to maintain human connections [inferred].	Human connection - neighbours and people's interactions. Creating divides - too big a building disconnects us from face to face connections and the environment around us.	Accept	Section 13
3896	S886.013	Tina Hanrahan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Incentivise the] repurposing or reinvention of existing buildings to create less waste.	Building materials, and materials that enhance space or connect humans to spaces. Sensitivity to building materials and waste materials. Existing buildings that can be repurposed or reinvented so to create less waste and impact on people and place.	Reject	Section 13
3897	S887.001	Carey Mason	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S887.002.	Reject	Section 13

3898	S887.002	Carey Mason	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3899	S887.003	Carey Mason	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3900	S887.004	Carey Mason	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
3901	S887.006	Carey Mason	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S887.005.	Reject	Section 13
3902	S887.010	Carey Mason	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3903	S887.011	Carey Mason	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 12
3904	FS28.079	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 in part	Section 12
3905	S887.013	Carey Mason	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3906	S887.018	Carey Mason	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S887.005 and S887.011.	Reject	Section 13

3907	S887.019	Carey Mason	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3908	S887.027	Carey Mason	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
3909	S887.029	Carey Mason	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3910	S887.030	Carey Mason	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3911	S888.001	Chris Allison	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Support the intention of the Plan Change.	Arguments for the need for intensification are fairly well established, are being presented by others, and will be familiar to Council. I support the intention of the proposed plan change. The potentially contentious issue is how, and where. The tricky geography, compact nature of the Nelson urban region, multiple hazards - many of which will be exacerbated by climate change - and vested interest make for a challenging exercise. Still, it's necessary and possible. But it requires a good process.	Accept in part	Section 12
3912	S888.012	Chris Allison	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Undertake an urban design process and develop comprehensive neighbourhood plans to guide and provide certainty about the form and locations of development, open space, outlook, privacy, etc. [inferred].	My biggest concern with the proposed changes, however, follows on from the point made by Nelsust; "most problematic, there is nothing in the proposals that deals with the issue of TRANSITIONING to a townhouse type in our higher density areas." This is a critical issue, and it links to an excellent opinion piece in the Nelson Mail (Can we intensify Nelson without a design? by Timo Neubauer. Nelson has a patchy history of either not doing such design work, or doing it and then ignoring it. What seems glaringly obvious is the absence of the existence and application of any form of 'comprehensive neighbourhood plan' that would 'give some certainty about the form and location of future buildings, open space areas for outlook and privacy, future public and private green spaces, play areas, potential new laneways and so on.' A plan that outlines some sort of cohesive, coherent design intention for the area. Who wants to live in a city that grows without adequate urban design, sprinkled with ad hoc developments, a legacy of expediency and wasted opportunity? [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 13

3913	S888.013	Chris Allison	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Give consideration to feasibility and affordability of high density development in proposed locations [inferred].	I live in Tahunanui, and the 2004 well-consulted-on Tahunanui Structure Plan is an example of doing [design] and then ignoring it. But I not only live in Tahuna, I live in one of the areas now designated for high density residential. Well, ok it has to go somewhere. Knowing the characteristics of this area though I wondered, why here? Looking at the hazards map (left), and the HDR zone (right), it would appear the answer to the question of why, in a suburb of predominantly single story buildings, 6 story apartment blocks are to be built, is essentially because the hazard profile allows for it. Oh, and are these lower value homes, which would realistically allow a developer to buy the multiple properties necessary for the scale required for the kind of 6 level buildings illustrated in plan documents? I think not. But if sufficient land was acquired, at some considerable cost, would it then result in the kind of affordable housing the intensification process should be aiming to address?	Accept in part	Section 12
3914	FS61.049	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- I live in Tahunanui, and the 2004 well-consulted-on Tahunanui Structure Plan is an example of doing [design] and then ignoring it. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support - We have repeatedly asked for an update of the Tahunanui Structure plan (2004) and feel largely ignored by NCC.	Accept in part	Section 12
3915	FS72.053	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- I live in Tahunanui, and the 2004 well-consulted-on Tahunanui Structure Plan is an example of doing [design] and then ignoring it. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support - We have repeatedly asked for an update of the Tahunanui Structure plan (2004) and feel largely ignored by NCC.	Accept in part	Section 12
3916	FS60.045	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- I live in Tahunanui, and the 2004 well-consulted-on Tahunanui Structure Plan is an example of doing [design] and then ignoring it. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support - We have repeatedly asked for an update of the Tahunanui Structure plan (2004) and feel largely ignored by NCC.	Accept in part	Section 12
3917	S888.014	Chris Allison	Residential Zones	Support in part	Support intensification around Stoke shopping area, Isel Park, and transport links but allow for neighbourhood variation to protect the amenity of Isel Park [inferred].	At least in the proposals for Stoke there is some kind of rationale to clustering the high and medium density areas around the (walkable to) shopping area, Isel Park, and good public and active transport links. But even here there appears to be no allowance for neighbourhood variation - do we really want 6 story apartment blocks butted right up to the north and south boundaries of Isel Park?	Accept in part	Section 12
3918	S889.001	Tahunanui Community Hub (TCH)	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	We have found it difficult to digest the total effect of the proposal PC29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity... We believe it has been to the detriment of residents & businesses and has contributed to a lack of buy-in, by NCC in not providing similar maps and a paper copy of PC29 in prominent spaces such as the local libraries and also at NCC. It is an incredibly complex document with many overlays, not easily digested by the lay person... People are very skeptical as to how much submitters are actually listened to? The pace of submissions placed on individuals and communities is at an alarming rate, especially with the huge ramifications proposed. We are not professionals and often are trying to coordinate meetings w boardmembers, around fulltime jobs and other commitments. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
3919	FS83.272	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12

3920	FS61.024	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Parts of these submissions we support/:- Delay and combine decision making on plan changes 29 and 30 with the consideration of sea level rise and coastal inundation after government policy on climate change is released [inferred]. We fully support that the area shaded light purple, designated commercia/residential, at the Tahunanui lights, and covering the Tahunanui Structure plan map (2004) including the shops and residential areas on the 'triangular area between Tahunanui Drive, Muritai Street and Beach road' is deemed only medium density unlike other areas in the PC29 in this colouring which are High density. Although we believe there is a significant heritage site, of high Maori value behind the Tahunanui Pharmacy which should be given the respect and designation it deserves. We do question why the Nellie Nightingale library fits under this zoning, considering this was bequeathed to the Tahunanui community, and would of thought should be included within the beach reserve that it boarders. We'd like to know why a conscious look at the state and condition of housing in Tahunanui and wider Nelson hasn't been considered as areas to focus? In particular the substandard state of housing in parts of Golf Rd, often referred to as 'Sausage housing', where old motels have been converted into family homes. We have families within our community living in these old one and two bedroom motel rooms alongside the majority of Nelson's recent Emergency and Social housing ALL based in Tahunanui. Many of these families, are doing their main grocery shop at the likes of the Night n Day dairy, local dairies and our Tahunanui Mobil Station. Residential neighborhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy, and new	Accept in part	Section 12
3921	FS72.024	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Parts of these submissions we support/:- Delay and combine decision making on plan changes 29 and 30 with the consideration of sea level rise and coastal inundation after government policy on climate change is released [inferred]. We fully support that the area shaded light purple, designated commercial/residential, at the Tahunanui lights, and covering the Tahunanui Structure plan map (2004) including the shops and residential areas on the 'triangular area between Tahunanui Drive, Muritai Street and Beach road' is deemed only medium density unlike other areas in the PC29 in this colouring which are High density. Although we believe there is a significant heritage site, of high Maori value behind the Tahunanui Pharmacy which should be given the respect and designation it deserves. We do question why the Nellie Nightingale library fits under this zoning, considering this was bequeathed to the Tahunanui community, and would of thought should be included within the beach reserve that it boarders. We'd like to know why a conscious look at the state and condition of housing in Tahunanui and wider Nelson hasn't been considered as areas to focus? In particular the substandard state of housing in parts of Golf Rd, often referred to as 'Sausage housing', where old motels have been converted into family homes. We have families within our community living in these old one and two bedroom motel rooms alongside the majority of Nelson's recent Emergency and Social housing ALL based in Tahunanui. Many of these families, are doing their main grocery shop at the likes of the Night n Day dairy, local dairies and our Tahunanui Mobil Station. Residential neighborhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy, and new	Accept in part	Section 12

3922	S889.002	Tahunanui Community Hub (TCH)	Mapping	Oppose	[Oppose] the broad brush zoning approach - of particular note in Tahunanui is the High Density zone, used for parts of the Tahunanui hills, around Tamaki Street [Inferred].	This area is far away from local facilities, such as the Tahunanui Beachside shopping village, medical facilities, Public transport. It is not easily accessible by bike or walking for members of the community who aren't nibble footed and fit, encouraging any access to be reliant of the private car... We have concerns relating to the infrastructure in this area, as the stormwater is shown to be sadly lacking and very aged, with many slips.. large slope instability and slippage... Very narrow, winding streets which have no public transport... we feel these areas are inappropriate to service high traffic volumes. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3923	FS83.273	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
3924	FS61.025	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Parts of these submissions we support/:- Delay and combine decision making on plan changes 29 and 30 with the consideration of sea level rise and coastal inundation after government policy on climate change is released [inferred]. We fully support that the area shaded light purple, designated commercia/residential, at the Tahunanui lights, and covering the Tahunanui Structure plan map (2004) including the shops and residential areas on the 'triangular area between Tahunanui Drive, Muritai Street and Beach road' is deemed only medium density unlike other areas in the PC29 in this colouring which are High density. Although we believe there is a significant heritage site, of high Maori value behind the Tahunanui Pharmacy which should be given the respect and designation it deserves. We do question why the Nellie Nightingale library fits under this zoning, considering this was bequeathed to the Tahunanui community, and would of thought should be included within the beach reserve that it boarders. We'd like to know why a conscious look at the state and condition of housing in Tahunanui and wider Nelson hasn't been considered as areas to focus? In particular the substandard state of housing in parts of Golf Rd, often referred to as 'Sausage housing', where old motels have been converted into family homes. We have families within our community living in these old one and two bedroom motel rooms alongside the majority of Nelson's recent Emergency and Social housing ALL based in Tahunanui. Many of these families, are doing their main grocery shop at the likes of the Night n Day dairy, local dairies and our Tahunanui Mobil Station. Residential neighborhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy, and new	Accept in part	Section 12

3925	FS72.025	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Parts of these submissions we support/:- Delay and combine decision making on plan changes 29 and 30 with the consideration of sea level rise and coastal inundation after government policy on climate change is released [inferred]. We fully support that the area shaded light purple, designated commercial/residential, at the Tahunanui lights, and covering the Tahunanui Structure plan map (2004) including the shops and residential areas on the 'triangular area between Tahunanui Drive, Muritai Street and Beach road' is deemed only medium density unlike other areas in the PC29 in this colouring which are High density. Although we believe there is a significant heritage site, of high Maori value behind the Tahunanui Pharmacy which should be given the respect and designation it deserves. We do question why the Nellie Nightingale library fits under this zoning, considering this was bequeathed to the Tahunanui community, and would of thought should be included within the beach reserve that it boarders. We'd like to know why a conscious look at the state and condition of housing in Tahunanui and wider Nelson hasn't been considered as areas to focus? In particular the substandard state of housing in parts of Golf Rd, often referred to as 'Sausage housing', where old motels have been converted into family homes. We have families within our community living in these old one and two bedroom motel rooms alongside the majority of Nelson's recent Emergency and Social housing ALL based in Tahunanui. Many of these families, are doing their main grocery shop at the likes of the Night n Day dairy, local dairies and our Tahunanui Mobil Station. Residential neighborhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy, and new	Accept in part	Section 12
3926	S889.006	Tahunanui Community Hub (TCH)	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Support Medium Density development in the Tahunanui community and wider Nelson region generally.	We support Medium density development in our Tahunanui Community and in the wider Nelson region, but we strongly believe that any High Density development should be reserved Only to the Flat areas in the Inner city shopping precinct and surrounding flat areas, in a mixed residential/commercial zone. Especially between St Vincent and Vanguard Streets. These are easily accessible by foot, bike or public transport to the nearest essential amenities. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject in part	Section 12
3927	FS28.157	Nelson Airport Limited		Oppose in part	Reject in part	The particular part of the submission we oppose in part is: Support Medium (but not high) Density development in the Tahunanui community and wider Nelson region generally. 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 higher intensification zoning across Tahunanui (flat) would provide for residential intensification as a permitted activity which is not appropriate in those areas subject to the Nelson Airport Overlays.	Accept in part	Section 12
3928	FS83.277	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12

3929	FS61.029	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Parts of these submissions we support/:- Delay and combine decision making on plan changes 29 and 30 with the consideration of sea level rise and coastal inundation after government policy on climate change is released [inferred]. We fully support that the area shaded light purple, designated commercia/residential, at the Tahunanui lights, and covering the Tahunanui Structure plan map (2004) including the shops and residential areas on the 'triangular area between Tahunanui Drive, Muritai Street and Beach road' is deemed only medium density unlike other areas in the PC29 in this colouring which are High density. Although we believe there is a significant heritage site, of high Maori value behind the Tahunanui Pharmacy which should be given the respect and designation it deserves. We do question why the Nellie Nightingale library fits under this zoning, considering this was bequeathed to the Tahunanui community, and would of thought should be included within the beach reserve that it boarders. We'd like to know why a conscious look at the state and condition of housing in Tahunanui and wider Nelson hasn't been considered as areas to focus? In particular the substandard state of housing in parts of Golf Rd, often referred to as 'Sausage housing', where old motels have been converted into family homes. We have families within our community living in these old one and two bedroom motel rooms alongside the majority of Nelson's recent Emergency and Social housing ALL based in Tahunanui. Many of these families, are doing their main grocery shop at the likes of the Night n Day dairy, local dairies and our Tahunanui Mobil Station. Residential neighborhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy, and new	Accept in part	Section 12
3930	FS72.029	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Parts of these submissions we support/:- Delay and combine decision making on plan changes 29 and 30 with the consideration of sea level rise and coastal inundation after government policy on climate change is released [inferred]. We fully support that the area shaded light purple, designated commercial/residential, at the Tahunanui lights, and covering the Tahunanui Structure plan map (2004) including the shops and residential areas on the 'triangular area between Tahunanui Drive, Muritai Street and Beach road' is deemed only medium density unlike other areas in the PC29 in this colouring which are High density. Although we believe there is a significant heritage site, of high Maori value behind the Tahunanui Pharmacy which should be given the respect and designation it deserves. We do question why the Nellie Nightingale library fits under this zoning, considering this was bequeathed to the Tahunanui community, and would of thought should be included within the beach reserve that it boarders. We'd like to know why a conscious look at the state and condition of housing in Tahunanui and wider Nelson hasn't been considered as areas to focus? In particular the substandard state of housing in parts of Golf Rd, often referred to as 'Sausage housing', where old motels have been converted into family homes. We have families within our community living in these old one and two bedroom motel rooms alongside the majority of Nelson's recent Emergency and Social housing ALL based in Tahunanui. Many of these families, are doing their main grocery shop at the likes of the Night n Day dairy, local dairies and our Tahunanui Mobil Station. Residential neighborhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy, and new	Accept in part	Section 12
3931	S889.007	Tahunanui Community Hub (TCH)	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Reserve high density development to only the flat areas in the inner city shopping precinct and surrounding flat areas in a mixed residential/ commercial zone. Especially between St Vincent and Vanguard Streets.	Refer to reasons in submission point S889.004.	Reject	Section 10
3932	FS83.278	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12

3933	FS61.030	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Parts of these submissions we support/:- Delay and combine decision making on plan changes 29 and 30 with the consideration of sea level rise and coastal inundation after government policy on climate change is released [inferred]. We fully support that the area shaded light purple, designated commercia/residential, at the Tahunanui lights, and covering the Tahunanui Structure plan map (2004) including the shops and residential areas on the 'triangular area between Tahunanui Drive, Muritai Street and Beach road' is deemed only medium density unlike other areas in the PC29 in this colouring which are High density. Although we believe there is a significant heritage site, of high Maori value behind the Tahunanui Pharmacy which should be given the respect and designation it deserves. We do question why the Nellie Nightingale library fits under this zoning, considering this was bequeathed to the Tahunanui community, and would of thought should be included within the beach reserve that it boarders. We'd like to know why a conscious look at the state and condition of housing in Tahunanui and wider Nelson hasn't been considered as areas to focus? In particular the substandard state of housing in parts of Golf Rd, often referred to as 'Sausage housing', where old motels have been converted into family homes. We have families within our community living in these old one and two bedroom motel rooms alongside the majority of Nelson's recent Emergency and Social housing ALL based in Tahunanui. Many of these families, are doing their main grocery shop at the likes of the Night n Day dairy, local dairies and our Tahunanui Mobil Station. Residential neighborhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy, and new	Accept in part	Section 12
3934	FS72.030	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Parts of these submissions we support/:- Delay and combine decision making on plan changes 29 and 30 with the consideration of sea level rise and coastal inundation after government policy on climate change is released [inferred]. We fully support that the area shaded light purple, designated commercial/residential, at the Tahunanui lights, and covering the Tahunanui Structure plan map (2004) including the shops and residential areas on the 'triangular area between Tahunanui Drive, Muritai Street and Beach road' is deemed only medium density unlike other areas in the PC29 in this colouring which are High density. Although we believe there is a significant heritage site, of high Maori value behind the Tahunanui Pharmacy which should be given the respect and designation it deserves. We do question why the Nellie Nightingale library fits under this zoning, considering this was bequeathed to the Tahunanui community, and would of thought should be included within the beach reserve that it boarders. We'd like to know why a conscious look at the state and condition of housing in Tahunanui and wider Nelson hasn't been considered as areas to focus? In particular the substandard state of housing in parts of Golf Rd, often referred to as 'Sausage housing', where old motels have been converted into family homes. We have families within our community living in these old one and two bedroom motel rooms alongside the majority of Nelson's recent Emergency and Social housing ALL based in Tahunanui. Many of these families, are doing their main grocery shop at the likes of the Night n Day dairy, local dairies and our Tahunanui Mobil Station. Residential neighborhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy, and new	Accept in part	Section 12

3935	S889.009	Tahunanui Community Hub (TCH)	Residential Zones	Amend	Focus on addressing the substandard state of housing in parts of Tāhunanui [inferred].	We'd like to know why a conscious look at the state and condition of housing in Tahunanui and wider Nelson hasn't been considered as areas to focus? In particular the substandard state of housing in parts of Golf Rd, often referred to as 'Sausage housing', where old motels have been converted into family homes. We have families within our community living in these old one and two bedroom motel rooms alongside the majority of Nelson's recent Emergency and Social housing ALL based in Tahunanui. Many of these families, are doing their main grocery shop at the likes of the Night n Day dairy, local dairies and our Tahunanui Mobil Station. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 12
3936	FS83.280	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12
3937	FS61.032	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Parts of these submissions we support/:- Delay and combine decision making on plan changes 29 and 30 with the consideration of sea level rise and coastal inundation after government policy on climate change is released [inferred]. We fully support that the area shaded light purple, designated commercia/residential, at the Tahunanui lights, and covering the Tahunanui Structure plan map (2004) including the shops and residential areas on the 'triangular area between Tahunanui Drive, Muritai Street and Beach road' is deemed only medium density unlike other areas in the PC29 in this colouring which are High density. Although we believe there is a significant heritage site, of high Maori value behind the Tahunanui Pharmacy which should be given the respect and designation it deserves. We do question why the Nellie Nightingale library fits under this zoning, considering this was bequeathed to the Tahunanui community, and would of thought should be included within the beach reserve that it boarders. We'd like to know why a conscious look at the state and condition of housing in Tahunanui and wider Nelson hasn't been considered as areas to focus? In particular the substandard state of housing in parts of Golf Rd, often referred to as 'Sausage housing', where old motels have been converted into family homes. We have families within our community living in these old one and two bedroom motel rooms alongside the majority of Nelson's recent Emergency and Social housing ALL based in Tahunanui. Many of these families, are doing their main grocery shop at the likes of the Night n Day dairy, local dairies and our Tahunanui Mobil Station. Residential neighborhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy, and new	Accept in part	Section 12

3938	FS72.032	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Parts of these submissions we support/:- Delay and combine decision making on plan changes 29 and 30 with the consideration of sea level rise and coastal inundation after government policy on climate change is released [inferred]. We fully support that the area shaded light purple, designated commercial/residential, at the Tahunanui lights, and covering the Tahunanui Structure plan map (2004) including the shops and residential areas on the 'triangular area between Tahunanui Drive, Muritai Street and Beach road' is deemed only medium density unlike other areas in the PC29 in this colouring which are High density. Although we believe there is a significant heritage site, of high Maori value behind the Tahunanui Pharmacy which should be given the respect and designation it deserves. We do question why the Nellie Nightingale library fits under this zoning, considering this was bequeathed to the Tahunanui community, and would of thought should be included within the beach reserve that it boarders. We'd like to know why a conscious look at the state and condition of housing in Tahunanui and wider Nelson hasn't been considered as areas to focus? In particular the substandard state of housing in parts of Golf Rd, often referred to as 'Sausage housing', where old motels have been converted into family homes. We have families within our community living in these old one and two bedroom motel rooms alongside the majority of Nelson's recent Emergency and Social housing ALL based in Tahunanui. Many of these families, are doing their main grocery shop at the likes of the Night n Day dairy, local dairies and our Tahunanui Mobil Station. Residential neighborhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy, and new	Accept in part	Section 12
3939	S889.011	Tahunanui Community Hub (TCH)	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Undertake neighbourhood planning, including an updated and expanded Tāhunanui structure plan [inferred].	Residential neighborhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy, and new developments thoughtfully designed and planned on a neighborhood by neighborhood, basis to maintain the essence of their character. The Tahunanui Business & Citizens Association has been asking for years for an update on the Tahunanui Structure Plan (2004) not just for the beachside village but also to incorporate surrounding residential areas. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3940	FS83.282	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12

3941	FS61.034	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Parts of these submissions we support/:- Delay and combine decision making on plan changes 29 and 30 with the consideration of sea level rise and coastal inundation after government policy on climate change is released [inferred]. We fully support that the area shaded light purple, designated commercia/residential, at the Tahunanui lights, and covering the Tahunanui Structure plan map (2004) including the shops and residential areas on the 'triangular area between Tahunanui Drive, Muritai Street and Beach road' is deemed only medium density unlike other areas in the PC29 in this colouring which are High density. Although we believe there is a significant heritage site, of high Maori value behind the Tahunanui Pharmacy which should be given the respect and designation it deserves. We do question why the Nellie Nightingale library fits under this zoning, considering this was bequeathed to the Tahunanui community, and would of thought should be included within the beach reserve that it boarders. We'd like to know why a conscious look at the state and condition of housing in Tahunanui and wider Nelson hasn't been considered as areas to focus? In particular the substandard state of housing in parts of Golf Rd, often referred to as 'Sausage housing', where old motels have been converted into family homes. We have families within our community living in these old one and two bedroom motel rooms alongside the majority of Nelson's recent Emergency and Social housing ALL based in Tahunanui. Many of these families, are doing their main grocery shop at the likes of the Night n Day dairy, local dairies and our Tahunanui Mobil Station. Residential neighborhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy, and new	Accept in part	Section 12
3942	FS72.034	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Parts of these submissions we support/:- Delay and combine decision making on plan changes 29 and 30 with the consideration of sea level rise and coastal inundation after government policy on climate change is released [inferred]. We fully support that the area shaded light purple, designated commercial/residential, at the Tahunanui lights, and covering the Tahunanui Structure plan map (2004) including the shops and residential areas on the 'triangular area between Tahunanui Drive, Muritai Street and Beach road' is deemed only medium density unlike other areas in the PC29 in this colouring which are High density. Although we believe there is a significant heritage site, of high Maori value behind the Tahunanui Pharmacy which should be given the respect and designation it deserves. We do question why the Nellie Nightingale library fits under this zoning, considering this was bequeathed to the Tahunanui community, and would of thought should be included within the beach reserve that it boarders. We'd like to know why a conscious look at the state and condition of housing in Tahunanui and wider Nelson hasn't been considered as areas to focus? In particular the substandard state of housing in parts of Golf Rd, often referred to as 'Sausage housing', where old motels have been converted into family homes. We have families within our community living in these old one and two bedroom motel rooms alongside the majority of Nelson's recent Emergency and Social housing ALL based in Tahunanui. Many of these families, are doing their main grocery shop at the likes of the Night n Day dairy, local dairies and our Tahunanui Mobil Station. Residential neighborhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy, and new	Accept in Part	Section 12
3943	S889.012	Tahunanui Community Hub (TCH)	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Improve protections for green spaces, trees and landscaping [inferred].	Green spaces, Trees and landscaping are essential for the look and feel of some of our older neighbourhoods, and any new developments should also include this as it is essential into the wellbeing of residents, not to mention proven to assist with the rising heat of climate change and liveability in communities. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 11
3944	FS83.283	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Section 12

3945	FS61.035	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Parts of these submissions we support/:- Delay and combine decision making on plan changes 29 and 30 with the consideration of sea level rise and coastal inundation after government policy on climate change is released [inferred]. We fully support that the area shaded light purple, designated commercia/residential, at the Tahunanui lights, and covering the Tahunanui Structure plan map (2004) including the shops and residential areas on the 'triangular area between Tahunanui Drive, Muritai Street and Beach road' is deemed only medium density unlike other areas in the PC29 in this colouring which are High density. Although we believe there is a significant heritage site, of high Maori value behind the Tahunanui Pharmacy which should be given the respect and designation it deserves. We do question why the Nellie Nightingale library fits under this zoning, considering this was bequeathed to the Tahunanui community, and would of thought should be included within the beach reserve that it boarders. We'd like to know why a conscious look at the state and condition of housing in Tahunanui and wider Nelson hasn't been considered as areas to focus? In particular the substandard state of housing in parts of Golf Rd, often referred to as 'Sausage housing', where old motels have been converted into family homes. We have families within our community living in these old one and two bedroom motel rooms alongside the majority of Nelson's recent Emergency and Social housing ALL based in Tahunanui. Many of these families, are doing their main grocery shop at the likes of the Night n Day dairy, local dairies and our Tahunanui Mobil Station. Residential neighborhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy, and new	Accept in part	Section 12
3946	FS72.035	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Parts of these submissions we support/:- Delay and combine decision making on plan changes 29 and 30 with the consideration of sea level rise and coastal inundation after government policy on climate change is released [inferred]. We fully support that the area shaded light purple, designated commercial/residential, at the Tahunanui lights, and covering the Tahunanui Structure plan map (2004) including the shops and residential areas on the 'triangular area between Tahunanui Drive, Muritai Street and Beach road' is deemed only medium density unlike other areas in the PC29 in this colouring which are High density. Although we believe there is a significant heritage site, of high Maori value behind the Tahunanui Pharmacy which should be given the respect and designation it deserves. We do question why the Nellie Nightingale library fits under this zoning, considering this was bequeathed to the Tahunanui community, and would of thought should be included within the beach reserve that it boarders. We'd like to know why a conscious look at the state and condition of housing in Tahunanui and wider Nelson hasn't been considered as areas to focus? In particular the substandard state of housing in parts of Golf Rd, often referred to as 'Sausage housing', where old motels have been converted into family homes. We have families within our community living in these old one and two bedroom motel rooms alongside the majority of Nelson's recent Emergency and Social housing ALL based in Tahunanui. Many of these families, are doing their main grocery shop at the likes of the Night n Day dairy, local dairies and our Tahunanui Mobil Station. Residential neighborhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy, and new	Accept in part	Section 12

3947	S891.001	John-Paul Pochin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Do not support PC29 as it stands.	I agree with the intent. If Nelson is to grow in population then from an environmental perspective we need to intensify, we can't continue to build outwards taking up more valuable land and destroying the natural environment. We also need to reduce the resources needed to construct new buildings and consider the environmental effects of any new development. However, at what point is Nelson 'big enough'? At what point do we stop growing our population? On a finite planet with finite resources we can't continue to grow indefinitely.	Reject	Section 9
3948	S891.005	John-Paul Pochin	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Require building methods, materials, removal and reuse of existing structures, and recycling of old materials to be considerations when determining if a new development can go ahead [inferred].	For any new developments the materials used, as well as the building methods and the removal of any existing structures should be assessed from an environmental perspective when determining whether the development can go ahead. Every [care] should be taken to repurpose existing structures, recycle what can't be repurposed and any new materials should have a minimum environmental impact.	Reject	Section 10
3949	S892.001	Marty Miller	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extinguish Plan Change 29.	Please refer to underlined and hi-vis high-lighted phrases, sentences and paragraphs in attached article titled: 'Firefighter access and housing intensification', David Hindley, BRANZ build: Issue 198, October/November 2023, pages 62-63, and 'Firefighting capability and building height', David Hindley, BRANZ build: Issue 198, October/November 2023, pages 64-66. I ask the following question, "will disabled persons have individual evacuation plans?" Firefighter access and housing intensification: The more homes there are and the closer together they are, the greater the risk of fire spreading to neighbouring buildings. The fire requirements in the current building code were originally put together for housing areas largely made-up of single homes on quarter acre sections beside the road. To reduce the risks to building occupants firefighters and the buildings themselves, Designers need to think about fire protection measures beyond those required in the building code. While most fire appliances have ladders sufficient for fighting fires in three storey buildings, there needs to be sufficient space to manoeuvre the ladder to where it is required - this is not an issue addressed in the building code. Firefighting capability and building height: Designers of higher rise buildings need to understand the abilities and limitations of fire fighting services and in particular their height capability. As urban intensification increases and rules change to permit more buildings three stories and above it becomes even more important for architects designers and urban planners to understand the height capabilities of firefighters and their appliances. From a height point of view a building designer should ask themselves how a fire appliance would access everything and how higher floors would be reached.	Reject	Section 9
3950	S893.001	Lilia and Eugen Grab	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirety.	I reject PC29 in its entirety. Refer to reasons in submission points S893.002 - S893.008.	Reject	Section 9
3951	S893.002	Lilia and Eugen Grab	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.	We oppose the proposed HDZ in residential areas where there is no walkable access to amenities (supermarkets, schools and public transport).	Accept in part	Section 12
3952	S893.004	Lilia and Eugen Grab	Entire Plan Change	Support	Prioritise intensification within the inner city before moving onto existing residential neighbourhoods [inferred].	We support the proposed increase in residential density in the inner city with mixed residential and commercial zones as these areas provide residents with direct walkable access to shopping and public transport services. The inner city should be the starting place for the most significant intensification before moving onto existing residential neighbourhoods.	Accept in part	Section 12

3953	S893.005	Lilia and Eugen Grab	Mapping	Oppose	Remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZ and make it GRZ.	If HDZ are approved for some areas, we particularly oppose the proposed HDZ in the Tahunanui Hills area. We ask the Council to remove Tahunanui Hills from the proposed HDZand make it GRZ because of ongoing slope instability in this area, lack of infrastructure, lack of the essential amenities (no supermarkets or public transport) within walking distance, and the increased likelihood of slips directly caused by intensification development and frequent weather events. [Refer to the following sections of the original submission for more detail: 1. Slope Instability, 2. Amenities, 3. Traffic, 4. Sunlight and Shading Effects, 5. Trees and Gardens in the Tahunanui Hills HDZ, 6. Recreation, and 7. Intensification].	Accept in part	Section 12
3954	FS61.083	Tahunanui Business and Citizens Assn		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- [Refer to the following sections of the original submission for more detail: 1. Slope Instability, 2. Amenities, 3. Traffic, 4. Sunlight and Shading Effects, 5. Trees and Gardens in the Tahunanui Hills HDZ, 6. Recreation, and 7. Intensification]. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- HDZ should be removed from Tahunanui hills for above 1-7 reasons.	Accept in part	Section 9
3955	FS72.087	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- [Refer to the following sections of the original submission for more detail]: 1. Slope Instability, 2. Amenities, 3. Traffic, 4. Sunlight and Shading Effects, 5. Trees and Gardens in the Tahunanui Hills HDZ, 6. Recreation, and 7. Intensification]. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- HDZ should be removed from Tahunanui hills for above 1-7 reasons.	Accept in part	Section 12
3956	FS60.079	Tahunanui Community Hub		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- [Refer to the following sections of the original submission for more detail: 1. Slope Instability, 2. Amenities, 3. Traffic, 4. Sunlight and Shading Effects, 5. Trees and Gardens in the Tahunanui Hills HDZ, 6. Recreation, and 7. Intensification]. Reject PC29 in its entirety. The reasons for my support:- HDZ should be removed from Tahunanui hills for above 1-7 reasons.	Accept in part	Section 9
3957	S893.009	Lilia and Eugen Grab	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Withdraw PC29 and have planning staff refine the plan design and follow the proper procedure of consultation and public engagement.	In our opinion, the PC29 process needs to be paused and re-evaluated before progressing to the hearing stage.	Reject	Section 13
3958	S893.010	Lilia and Eugen Grab	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Inform all rate payers individually with emails and letters about any changes to their property zoning and to give each ratepayer the opportunity to respond.	We have found the lack of early public engagement and consultation on Plan Change 29 extremely stressful. We only found out about the plan change by chance through a neighbour. There was no letter or email from the Nelson City Council. When we questioned this we were told we should have read the Nelson Evening Mail and we should have been looking on the Nelson City Council website. We have still received nothing by email or letter from the Council about the proposed change plan to our property	Reject	Section 13
3959	S893.011	Lilia and Eugen Grab	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint independent hearing commissioners for the plan change.	We question why the hearing panel is not made up of independent hearing commissioners as it is a council led plan change.	Reject	Section 13
3960	S893.012	Lilia and Eugen Grab	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC for population growth which have informed the intensification requirements are not Statistics NZ medium projections.	Reject	Section 10

3961	S894.006	The New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Residential Zones	Support	Support the extent of the High Density Residential zone.	Waka Kotahi is generally supportive of the proposed high and medium density residential zones in close proximity to the Central City, Tāhunanui and Stoke, all with easy access to public transport. An accessibility assessment was undertaken to inform the spatial extent of the proposed zones. Walkability to employment, education, and recreation opportunities was a key criteria in determining the suitability of intensification near the City Centre, Stoke and Tāhunanui. This approach is supported by Waka Kotahi. It is considered that the proposed catchment sizes will enable the realisation of benefits associated with high densities, including access to services, employment and recreation. A large base population will also support existing and future public and active transport mode initiatives. With respect to Stoke and Tāhunanui, intensification is proposed with some provision for nearby commercial activities, to provide for people's day-to-day needs within a walkable catchment. There is also good connections from these suburbs to both Richmond and the Nelson CBD via public transport and active mode transportation routes.	Accept in part	Section 12
3962	S894.007	The New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Residential Zones	Support	Support the extent of the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Refer to reasons in submission point S894.006.	Reject	Section 12
3963	S894.016	The New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support PC29 as an enabling environment for delivery of the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy 2022-2052.	Tasman District Council and Nelson City Council have adopted the Nelson Tasman Future Development Strategy 2022-2052 (NTFDS). The Councils are currently developing their Future Development Strategy (FDS) implementation plan. This will include specific actions setting out prioritisation and staging of urban development in their respective districts. Waka Kotahi considers that PC29 provides an enabling environment for delivery of this.	Accept	Section 5
3964	S896.021	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Ngāti Rārua supports the general approach to climate change in Proposed Plan Change29, as set out in 10.2 of the Section 32 Report.	These approaches include: • Increased opportunity for intensification close to the city centre and suburban centres, • Implementing changes to support the Active Travel Strategy, which supports a reduction in transport greenhouse gas emissions through shifts away from private vehicle dominance, • Including reference to water tanks and solar panels in the definition of structures, • Generally not upzoning land that is subject to coastal and/or river flood hazard, • A new objective, and new policies, rules and overlays to manage natural hazards, • Changes to stormwater management rules to minimise impermeable surfaces.	Reject	Section 12
3965	S897.001	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S897.002.	Reject	Section 13
3966	S897.002	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3967	S897.003	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13

3968	S897.004	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
3969	S897.006	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S897.005.	Reject	Section 13
3970	S897.010	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3971	S897.011	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	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 12
3972	FS28.080	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 in part	Section 12
3973	S897.013	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3974	S897.018	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S897.005 and S897.011.	Reject	Section 13
3975	S897.019	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3976	S897.027	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	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

3977	S897.029	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3978	S897.030	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3979	S898.001	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Entire Plan Change	Support	Ryman seeks the relief sought by the RVA in its submission on PC29 [Submission S901].	Ryman adopts the RVA's submission on PC29. In addition, Ryman wishes to emphasise that PC29 could have a significant impact on the provision of housing and care for Nelson's growing ageing population. There is a real risk that the proposed changes will delay necessary retirement and aged care accommodation in the region.	Accept	Section 9
3980	S899.001	Derek Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S899.002.	Reject	Section 13
3981	S899.002	Derek Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3982	S899.003	Derek Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3983	S899.004	Derek Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
3984	S899.006	Derek Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S899.005.	Reject	Section 13
3985	S899.010	Derek Austin	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
3986	S899.011	Derek Austin	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 12
3987	FS28.081	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 in part	Section 12

3988	S899.013	Derek Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
3989	S899.018	Derek Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S899.005 and S899.011.	Reject	Section 13
3990	S899.019	Derek Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
3991	S899.027	Derek Austin	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
3992	S899.029	Derek Austin	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3993	S899.030	Derek Austin	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
3994	S900.001	Karen Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S900.002.	Reject	Section 13
3995	S900.002	Karen Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
3996	S900.003	Karen Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
3997	S900.004	Karen Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10

3998	S900.006	Karen Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S900.005.	Reject	Section 13
3999	S900.010	Karen Austin	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4000	FS28.082	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 in part	Section 12
4001	S900.011	Karen Austin	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 12
4002	S900.013	Karen Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4003	S900.018	Karen Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S900.005 and S900.011.	Reject	Section 13
4004	S900.019	Karen Austin	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4005	S900.027	Karen Austin	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
4006	S900.029	Karen Austin	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

4007	S900.030	Karen Austin	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4008	S902.001	John Furtak	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S902.002.	Reject	Section 13
4009	S902.002	John Furtak	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4010	S902.003	John Furtak	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4011	S902.004	John Furtak	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4012	S902.006	John Furtak	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S902.005.	Reject	Section 13
4013	S902.010	John Furtak	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4014	S902.011	John Furtak	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 12
4015	FS28.083	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 in part	Section 12
4016	S902.013	John Furtak	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4017	S902.018	John Furtak	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S902.005 and S902.011.	Reject	Section 13

4018	S902.019	John Furtak	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4019	S902.027	John Furtak	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
4020	S902.029	John Furtak	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4021	S902.030	John Furtak	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4022	S902.031	John Furtak	Inner City and City Fringe Zones	Not Stated	NCC should budget funds for a survey of inner city properties for the assessment of viability of dwellings incorporated into existing buildings and dwelling potential of vacant and soon to be vacant properties. Working with building owners to discuss the benefits of incorporating homes into the built fabric.	Some sort of incentive funding would also help property owners to seriously consider dwellings incorporated into their properties. Does the councils town planners even know how many built unused spaces there are in the CBD?	Reject	Section 4
4023	S903.001	Nigel Perks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S903.002.	Reject	Section 13
4024	S903.002	Nigel Perks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4025	S903.003	Nigel Perks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4026	S903.004	Nigel Perks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10

4027	S903.006	Nigel Perks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S903.005.	Reject	Section 13
4028	S903.010	Nigel Perks	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4029	S903.011	Nigel Perks	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 12
4030	FS28.084	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 in part	Section 12
4031	S903.013	Nigel Perks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4032	S903.018	Nigel Perks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S903.005 and S903.011.	Reject	Section 13
4033	S903.019	Nigel Perks	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4034	S903.027	Nigel Perks	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
4035	S903.029	Nigel Perks	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

4036	S903.030	Nigel Perks	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4037	S904.001	Katherine Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S904.002.	Reject	Section 13
4038	S904.002	Katherine Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions. Provide an opportunity for LOCAL building / landscape architects to input.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail] As a ratepayer I voted you in to work for me, not Central Government and I suggest that you opt out of this plan and redesign something else that does not have a negative effect on already existing homes. Plan Change 29 was sprung on people and difficult in parts to understand. There are many ordinary people who would like to submit but who are not qualified, have the expertise, knowledge or confidence to do this. Refer to original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 13
4039	S904.003	Katherine Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4040	S904.004	Katherine Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ. There is many empty housing in Nelson sitting empty - why? Where is the data re housing demand to justify this plan?	Reject	Section 10
4041	S904.006	Katherine Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S904.005. [I] do not want to see intensification and development controlled by Kainga Ora, Developers, Iwi and other landowners.	Reject	Section 13
4042	S904.010	Katherine Waide	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail] Intensive housing leads to all softs of social issues... noise, loss of privacy, health, Covid and recurring viruses are here to stay and close living has been proven to be detrimental.	Accept	Section 12
4043	S904.011	Katherine Waide	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 12
4044	FS28.085	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 in part	Section 12

4045	S904.013	Katherine Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4046	S904.018	Katherine Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S904.005 and S904.011.	Reject	Section 13
4047	S904.019	Katherine Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4048	S904.027	Katherine Waide	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
4049	S904.029	Katherine Waide	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4050	S904.030	Katherine Waide	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4051	S904.031	Katherine Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Intensification needs to stay within the Nelson CBD area where you are wanting and needing more of a vibrant atmosphere.	I am opposed to the Plan 29 to intensify the beautiful suburb of Stoke. Stoke has been my home all of my life. I own a small sunny section which backs onto a suburban/commercial zone. If this plan goes ahead in its current form I will face being blocked in with no sunlight, more noise and no privacy. Stoke offers very little job opportunities, in fact there were more shops and banks in the 80's than what there is to offer now. Unfortunately overseas corporates and online shopping have changed our shopping habits and has had a negative effect on your local family owned business, hence the amount of vacant shops and buildings in the CBD. Stoke has had some huge housing subdivisions, including the opening up of Exeter Street, Marsden Valley and Ngawhatu, just to name a few. Stoke is a popular place for families as we have many schools, primary, intermediate and the zoned Nayland College. Apartments and units are not what families need.	Reject	Section 13
4052	S904.032	Katherine Waide	Residential Zones	Oppose	Redevelop existing public housing in areas such as Karaka Street, Orchard Street, and Seaview Road into Medium Density Housing.	This would bring these existing buildings into a modern 21st century and not have a negative effect on the residential areas in Stoke. Refer to reasons in submission point S904.031.	Reject	Section 13
4053	S904.033	Katherine Waide	Infrastructure	Oppose	Establish another co-ed college.	Along with intensification in town, there needs to be at least another co-ed college built to take the pressure of existing co-ed colleges.	Reject	Section 11

4054	S904.034	Katherine Waide	Infrastructure	Oppose	Infrastructure and roads need attention first.	Our infrastructure is already not coping with the amount of people already residing in Nelson. Hospitals, doctors, wastewater, and roads are a complete shambles. Nelson is becoming a rundown city which is a shame.	Reject	Section 10
4055	S904.035	Katherine Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Put a height limit on all buildings [and] no buildings on the ridgelines.	We need to keep views of surrounds, hills, sea, etc. and not be blocked.	Reject	Section 12
4056	S904.036	Katherine Waide	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider [rules regarding] lighting (the night sky).	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4057	S905.001	David and Clare Haig	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S905.002.	Reject	Section 13
4058	S905.002	David and Clare Haig	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4059	S905.003	David and Clare Haig	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4060	S905.004	David and Clare Haig	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4061	S905.006	David and Clare Haig	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S905.005.	Reject	Section 13
4062	S905.010	David and Clare Haig	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4063	S905.011	David and Clare Haig	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 12
4064	FS28.086	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 in part	Section 12
4065	S905.013	David and Clare Haig	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13

4066	S905.018	David and Clare Haig	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S905.005 and S905.011.	Reject	Section 13
4067	S905.019	David and Clare Haig	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4068	S905.027	David and Clare Haig	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
4069	S905.029	David and Clare Haig	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4070	S905.030	David and Clare Haig	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4071	S906.001	John Stone	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons on submission point S906.002.	Reject	Section 13
4072	S906.002	John Stone	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4073	S906.003	John Stone	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4074	S906.004	John Stone	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10

4075	S906.006	John Stone	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S906.005.	Reject	Section 13
4076	S906.010	John Stone	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4077	S906.011	John Stone	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 12
4078	FS28.087	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 in part	Section 12
4079	S906.013	John Stone	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. Eg Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4080	S906.018	John Stone	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S906.005 and S906.011.	Reject	Section 13
4081	S906.019	John Stone	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4082	S906.029	John Stone	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4083	S906.030	John Stone	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4084	S907.001	James McNabb	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons on submission point S907.002.	Reject	Section 13

4085	S907.002	James McNabb	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4086	S907.003	James McNabb	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4087	S907.004	James McNabb	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4088	S907.006	James McNabb	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S907.005.	Reject	Section 13
4089	S907.010	James McNabb	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4090	S907.011	James McNabb	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 12
4091	FS28.088	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 in part	Section 12
4092	S907.013	James McNabb	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. Eg Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4093	S907.018	James McNabb	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S907.005 and S907.011.	Reject	Section 13

4094	S907.019	James McNabb	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4095	S907.027	James McNabb	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
4096	S907.029	James McNabb	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4097	S907.030	James McNabb	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4098	S908.001	Joel Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S908.002.	Reject	Section 13
4099	S908.002	Joel Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4100	S908.003	Joel Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4101	S908.004	Joel Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4102	S908.006	Joel Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S908.005.	Reject	Section 13

4103	S908.010	Joel Collier	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4104	S908.011	Joel Collier	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 12
4105	FS28.089	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 in part	Section 12
4106	S908.013	Joel Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4107	S908.018	Joel Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S908.005 and S908.011.	Reject	Section 13
4108	S908.019	Joel Collier	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4109	S908.027	Joel Collier	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
4110	S908.029	Joel Collier	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4111	S908.030	Joel Collier	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4112	S909.001	Judith Haywood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S909.002.	Reject	Section 13

4113	S909.002	Judith Haywood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4114	S909.003	Judith Haywood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4115	S909.004	Judith Haywood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4116	S909.006	Judith Haywood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S909.005.	Reject	Section 13
4117	S909.010	Judith Haywood	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4118	S909.011	Judith Haywood	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 12
4119	FS28.090	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 in part	Section 12
4120	S909.013	Judith Haywood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4121	S909.018	Judith Haywood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S909.005 and S909.011.	Reject	Section 13

4122	S909.019	Judith Haywood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4123	S909.027	Judith Haywood	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
4124	S909.029	Judith Haywood	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4125	S909.030	Judith Haywood	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4126	S910.001	Myron Ouston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S910.002.	Reject	Section 13
4127	S910.002	Myron Ouston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4128	S910.003	Myron Ouston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4129	S910.004	Myron Ouston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4130	S910.006	Myron Ouston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S910.005.	Reject	Section 13
4131	S910.010	Myron Ouston	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12

4132	S910.011	Myron Ouston	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 12
4133	FS28.091	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 in part	Section 12
4134	S910.013	Myron Ouston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. Eg Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4135	S910.018	Myron Ouston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S910.005 and S910.011.	Reject	Section 13
4136	S910.019	Myron Ouston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4137	S910.026	Myron Ouston	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
4138	S910.028	Myron Ouston	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4139	S910.029	Myron Ouston	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4140	S911.001	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S911.002.	Reject	Section 13

4141	S911.002	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4142	S911.003	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4143	S911.004	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4144	S911.006	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S911.005.	Reject	Section 13
4145	S911.010	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4146	S911.011	Katy (Jane) Kerby	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 12
4147	FS28.092	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 in part	Section 12
4148	S911.013	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. Eg Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4149	S911.018	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S911.005 and S911.011.	Reject	Section 13

4150	S911.019	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4151	S911.027	Katy (Jane) Kerby	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
4152	S911.029	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4153	S911.030	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4154	S912.001	Nicola Ouston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S912.002.	Reject	Section 13
4155	S912.002	Nicola Ouston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4156	S912.003	Nicola Ouston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4157	S912.004	Nicola Ouston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4158	S912.006	Nicola Ouston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S912.005.	Reject	Section 13
4159	S912.010	Nicola Ouston	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12

4160	S912.011	Nicola Ouston	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 12
4161	FS28.093	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 in part	Section 12
4162	S912.013	Nicola Ouston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4163	S912.018	Nicola Ouston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S912.005 and S912.011.	Reject	Section 13
4164	S912.019	Nicola Ouston	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4165	S912.027	Nicola Ouston	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
4166	S912.029	Nicola Ouston	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4167	S912.030	Nicola Ouston	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4168	S913.001	Melanie Scott	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons on submission point S913.002.	Reject	Section 13

4169	S913.002	Melanie Scott	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4170	S913.003	Melanie Scott	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	AppointCouncillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14thvote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independentCommissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4171	S913.004	Melanie Scott	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4172	S913.006	Melanie Scott	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S913.005.	Reject	Section 13
4173	S913.010	Melanie Scott	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4174	S913.011	Melanie Scott	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 12
4175	FS28.094	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 in part	Section 12
4176	S913.013	Melanie Scott	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4177	S913.018	Melanie Scott	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S913.005 and S913.011.	Reject	Section 13

4178	S913.019	Melanie Scott	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4179	S913.027	Melanie Scott	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
4180	S913.029	Melanie Scott	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4181	S913.030	Melanie Scott	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4182	S914.001	Andrew Hume	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S914.002.	Reject	Section 13
4183	S914.002	Andrew Hume	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4184	S914.003	Andrew Hume	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4185	S914.004	Andrew Hume	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4186	S914.006	Andrew Hume	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S914.005.	Reject	Section 13
4187	S914.010	Andrew Hume	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12

4188	S914.011	Andrew Hume	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 12
4189	FS28.095	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 in part	Section 12
4190	S914.013	Andrew Hume	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4191	S914.018	Andrew Hume	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S914.005 and S914.011.	Reject	Section 13
4192	S914.019	Andrew Hume	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4193	S914.027	Andrew Hume	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
4194	S914.029	Andrew Hume	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4195	S914.030	Andrew Hume	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4196	S915.001	Amanda Haywood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S915.002.	Reject	Section 13

4197	S915.002	Amanda Haywood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 13
4198	S915.003	Amanda Haywood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	AppointCouncillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14thvote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independentCommissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4199	S915.004	Amanda Haywood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4200	S915.006	Amanda Haywood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S915.005.	Reject	Section 13
4201	S915.010	Amanda Haywood	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Accept	Section 12
4202	S915.011	Amanda Haywood	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 12
4203	FS28.096	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 in part	Section 12
4204	S915.013	Amanda Haywood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4205	S915.018	Amanda Haywood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S915.005 and S915.011.	Reject	Section 13

4206	S915.019	Amanda Haywood	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4207	S915.027	Amanda Haywood	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
4208	S915.029	Amanda Haywood	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4209	S915.030	Amanda Haywood	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4210	S916.001	Emily Morgan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S916.002.	Reject	Section 13
4211	S916.002	Emily Morgan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4212	S916.003	Emily Morgan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	AppointCouncillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14thvote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independentCommissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4213	S916.004	Emily Morgan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4214	S916.006	Emily Morgan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S916.005.	Reject	Section 13
4215	S916.010	Emily Morgan	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12

4216	S916.011	Emily Morgan	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 12
4217	FS28.097	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 in part	Section 12
4218	S916.013	Emily Morgan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4219	S916.018	Emily Morgan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S916.005 and S916.011.	Reject	Section 13
4220	S916.019	Emily Morgan	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4221	S916.027	Emily Morgan	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
4222	S916.029	Emily Morgan	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4223	S916.030	Emily Morgan	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4224	S917.001	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons on submission point S917.002.	Reject	Section 13

4225	S917.002	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4226	S917.003	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	AppointCouncillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, ifnot then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4227	S917.004	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4228	S917.006	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S917.005.	Reject	Section 13
4229	S917.010	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4230	FS28.098	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 in part	Section 12
4231	S917.011	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	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 12
4232	S917.013	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. Eg Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4233	S917.018	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S917.005 and S917.011.	Reject	Section 13

4234	S917.019	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4235	S917.027	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	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
4236	S917.029	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4237	S917.030	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4238	S918.001	Michelle Sowman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S918.002.	Reject	Section 13
4239	S918.002	Michelle Sowman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4240	S918.010	Michelle Sowman	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4241	S918.011	Michelle Sowman	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 12
4242	FS28.099	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 in part	Section 12

4243	S918.013	Michelle Sowman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4244	S918.018	Michelle Sowman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S918.011.	Reject	Section 13
4245	S918.019	Michelle Sowman	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4246	S918.027	Michelle Sowman	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
4247	S918.029	Michelle Sowman	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4248	S918.030	Michelle Sowman	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4249	S919.001	Gary Burns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S919.002.	Reject	Section 13
4250	S919.002	Gary Burns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4251	S919.003	Gary Burns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	AppointCouncillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, ifnot then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13

4252	S919.004	Gary Burns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4253	S919.006	Gary Burns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S919.005.	Reject	Section 13
4254	S919.010	Gary Burns	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4255	S919.011	Gary Burns	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 12
4256	FS28.100	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 in part	Section 12
4257	S919.013	Gary Burns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4258	S919.018	Gary Burns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S919.005 and S919.011.	Reject	Section 13
4259	S919.019	Gary Burns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Section 10
4260	S919.027	Gary Burns	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

4261	S919.029	Gary Burns	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	No specific reason given.	Reject	Section 11
4262	S919.030	Gary Burns	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	No specific reason given.	Reject	Section 11
4263	S920.001	Pauline Miller	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S920.002.	Reject	Section 13
4264	S920.002	Pauline Miller	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4265	S920.003	Pauline Miller	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4266	S920.004	Pauline Miller	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4267	S920.006	Pauline Miller	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S920.005.	Reject	Section 13
4268	S920.010	Pauline Miller	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4269	S920.011	Pauline Miller	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 12
4270	FS28.101	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 in part	Section 12
4271	S920.013	Pauline Miller	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13

4272	S920.018	Pauline Miller	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S920.005 and S920.011.	Reject	Section 13
4273	S920.019	Pauline Miller	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4274	S920.027	Pauline Miller	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
4275	S920.029	Pauline Miller	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4276	S920.030	Pauline Miller	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4277	S921.001	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S921.002.	Reject	Section 13
4278	S921.002	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4279	S921.003	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4280	S921.004	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10

4281	S921.006	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S921.005.	Reject	Section 13
4282	S921.010	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4283	S921.011	Saskia Roeske-Wout	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 12
4284	FS28.102	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 in part	Section 12
4285	S921.013	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4286	S921.018	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S921.011.	Reject	Section 13
4287	S921.019	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4288	S921.027	Saskia Roeske-Wout	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
4289	S921.029	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11

4290	S921.030	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4291	S922.001	Rick Miller	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to the reasons on submission point S922.002.	Reject	Section 13
4292	S922.002	Rick Miller	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4293	S922.010	Rick Miller	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4294	S922.011	Rick Miller	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 12
4295	FS28.103	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 in part	Section 12
4296	S922.013	Rick Miller	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4297	S922.018	Rick Miller	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S922.011.	Reject	Section 13
4298	S922.019	Rick Miller	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10

4299	S922.027	Rick Miller	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
4300	S922.029	Rick Miller	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4301	S922.030	Rick Miller	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4302	S923.001	Tyler Hemi	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S923.002.	Reject	Section 13
4303	S923.002	Tyler Hemi	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4304	S923.003	Tyler Hemi	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4305	S923.004	Tyler Hemi	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4306	S923.006	Tyler Hemi	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S923.005.	Reject	Section 13
4307	S923.010	Tyler Hemi	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4308	S923.011	Tyler Hemi	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 12

4309	FS28.104	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 in part	Section 12
4310	S923.013	Tyler Hemi	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. Eg Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4311	S923.018	Tyler Hemi	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S923.005 and S923.011.	Reject	Section 13
4312	S923.019	Tyler Hemi	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4313	S923.027	Tyler Hemi	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
4314	S923.029	Tyler Hemi	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4315	S923.030	Tyler Hemi	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4316	S924.001	Shirley Burns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S924.002.	Reject	Section 13
4317	S924.002	Shirley Burns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

4318	S924.003	Shirley Burns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote, if not then I ask that all Councillors are replaced with independent Commissioners.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4319	S924.004	Shirley Burns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4320	S924.006	Shirley Burns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S924.005.	Reject	Section 13
4321	S924.010	Shirley Burns	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4322	S924.011	Shirley Burns	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 12
4323	FS28.105	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 in part	Section 12
4324	S924.013	Shirley Burns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4325	S924.018	Shirley Burns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S924.005 and S924.011.	Reject	Section 13
4326	S924.019	Shirley Burns	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10

4327	S924.027	Shirley Burns	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
4328	S924.029	Shirley Burns	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4329	S924.030	Shirley Burns	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4330	S925.001	Nicole Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S925.002.	Reject	Section 13
4331	S925.002	Nicole Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4332	S925.003	Nicole Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4333	S925.004	Nicole Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4334	S925.006	Nicole Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S925.005.	Reject	Section 13
4335	S925.010	Nicole Gibson	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4336	S925.011	Nicole Gibson	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 12

4337	FS28.106	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 in part	Section 12
4338	S925.013	Nicole Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4339	S925.018	Nicole Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S925.005 and S925.011.	Reject	Section 13
4340	S925.019	Nicole Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4341	S925.027	Nicole Gibson	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
4342	S925.029	Nicole Gibson	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4343	S925.030	Nicole Gibson	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4344	S926.001	Nathan Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons on submission point S926.002.	Reject	Section 13
4345	S926.002	Nathan Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

4346	S926.003	Nathan Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4347	S926.004	Nathan Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4348	S926.006	Nathan Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S926.005.	Reject	Section 13
4349	S926.010	Nathan Gibson	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4350	S926.011	Nathan Gibson	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 12
4351	FS28.107	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 in part	Section 12
4352	S926.013	Nathan Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4353	S926.018	Nathan Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission point S926.005 and S926.011.	Reject	Section 13
4354	S926.019	Nathan Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10

4355	S926.027	Nathan Gibson	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
4356	S926.029	Nathan Gibson	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4357	S926.030	Nathan Gibson	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4358	S927.001	Matthew Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S927.002.	Reject	Section 13
4359	S927.002	Matthew Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4360	S927.003	Matthew Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4361	S927.004	Matthew Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4362	S927.006	Matthew Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S927.005.	Reject	Section 13
4363	S927.010	Matthew Gibson	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4364	S927.011	Matthew Gibson	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 12

4365	FS28.108	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 in part	Section 12
4366	S927.013	Matthew Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4367	S927.018	Matthew Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S927.005 and S927.011.	Reject	Section 13
4368	S927.019	Matthew Gibson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4369	S927.027	Matthew Gibson	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
4370	S927.029	Matthew Gibson	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4371	S927.030	Matthew Gibson	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4372	S928.001	Kade Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S928.002.	Reject	Section 13
4373	S928.002	Kade Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

4374	S928.003	Kade Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4375	S928.004	Kade Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4376	S928.006	Kade Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S928.005.	Reject	Section 13
4377	S928.010	Kade Smith	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4378	S928.011	Kade Smith	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 12
4379	FS28.109	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 in part	Section 12
4380	S928.013	Kade Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4381	S928.018	Kade Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S928.005 and S928.011.	Reject	Section 13
4382	S928.019	Kade Smith	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10

4383	S928.027	Kade Smith	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
4384	S928.029	Kade Smith	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4385	S928.030	Kade Smith	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4386	S929.001	Nichola Tyree	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S929.002.	Reject	Section 13
4387	S929.002	Nichola Tyree	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4388	S929.003	Nichola Tyree	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint Councillors [to the Hearing Panel] from either side of the Sept 14th vote.	Hearing panel members should be changed because of the 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.	Reject	Section 13
4389	S929.004	Nichola Tyree	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4390	S929.006	Nichola Tyree	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S929.005.	Reject	Section 13
4391	S929.010	Nichola Tyree	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4392	S929.011	Nichola Tyree	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 12

4393	FS28.110	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 in part	Section 12
4394	S929.013	Nichola Tyree	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4395	S929.018	Nichola Tyree	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S929.005 and S929.011.	Reject	Section 13
4396	S929.019	Nichola Tyree	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4397	S929.027	Nichola Tyree	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
4398	S929.029	Nichola Tyree	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4399	S929.030	Nichola Tyree	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4400	S932.001	Belinda Pooley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 in its entirely.	Refer to reasons in submission point S932.002.	Reject	Section 13
4401	S932.002	Belinda Pooley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Request] Council withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.	It has been difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity. Access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer. A lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council has meant PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13

4402	S932.004	Belinda Pooley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.	The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.	Reject	Section 10
4403	S932.006	Belinda Pooley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.	Refer to reasons in submission point S932.005.	Reject	Section 13
4404	S932.010	Belinda Pooley	Mapping	Oppose	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the plan completely.	High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Section 12
4405	S932.011	Belinda Pooley	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 12
4406	FS28.111	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 in part	Section 12
4407	S932.013	Belinda Pooley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.	Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. E.g. Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.	Reject	Section 13
4408	S932.018	Belinda Pooley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.	Refer to reasons in submission points S932.005 and S932.011.	Reject	Section 13
4409	S932.019	Belinda Pooley	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29] to progressively phase intensification starting with the inner city, followed by the city fringe and then applying the Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, provided AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.	Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods. Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification. Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke). [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 10
4410	S932.027	Belinda Pooley	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

4411	S932.029	Belinda Pooley	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water and stormwater systems.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4412	S932.030	Belinda Pooley	Infrastructure	Oppose	Include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4413	S933.001	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	[Seek] That the specific amendments, additions or retentions which are sought as specifically outlined in the subsequent submission points from ...-... are accepted and adopted into the Nelson Resource Management Plan, including such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in this submission.	Kainga Ora is generally supportive of PC29 and especially to the extent that the Plan Change is more enabling of residential development within the residential and business zones. Amendments are sought on specific matters.	Accept in part	Section 12
4414	S933.002	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	[Seek] That the specific amendments, additions or retentions which are sought as specifically outlined in the subsequent submission points from ...-... are accepted and adopted into the Nelson Resource Management Plan, including such further, alternative orconsequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in this submission.	Kainga Ora Supports: The recognition of the need for well-functioning urban environments (consistent with the direction set out in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 ("NPS-UD'). The provision of medium density and high density housing in a large portion of the existing residential areas across the city. The recognition of the need to provide sufficient development capacity to meet long term demands for housing. The introduction of a papakainga chapter which promotes the enablement of papakainga in urban environments. The need to manage significant risks from natural hazards;. The promotion of a compact urban form and residential intensification in Nelson City. The provision for enabling medium to high density residential development within a walkable catchment of the City Centre and larger Commercial Centres.	Accept in part	Section 13
4415	S933.013	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Entire Plan Change	Oppose in part	Where [Council wants] particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specifically stated in policies and matters of discretion.	[Further to S933.010 and S933.011], if there is content of the [AD10.2.i] Design Guideline[s] that Council wants in the Plan, Kainga Ora seeks that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion. Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment.	Accept in part	Section 12
4416	S934.001	Nicholas Priest	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	Utilise accurate popluation growth models to inform intensification [inferred].	Why is Plan 29 necessary? We are told there will be a large increase in population. Why? Who is driving this and why? House prices are high. Why who is driving this and why? Nelson is told to increase intensity based on what? What models indicate this and why? (modelling is notoriously inaccurate as the recent COVID debacle has shown) The above questions are key in understanding what is driving this when NZ pollution is only growing due to importing people from around the world.	Reject	Section 12
4417	S934.004	Nicholas Priest	Inner City and City Fringe Zones	Amend	Protect character and culture of Nelson and improve town centre trade and vibrancy [inferred].	The town stands to lose a lot of its character and culture if this is not managed correctly. Nelson has a vibe and a culture; it is distinctive [and] borne out in many ways but the Saturday market is a key indicator of the city's community orientation. Will the town centre improve, with increased trade and vibrancy?	Accept in part	Section 12

4418	S934.005	Nicholas Priest	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Determine appropriate incentives for developers to create attractive buildings and designs that address the street [inferred].	Will the fabric of Nelson be further undone with more faceless/characterless development. The incentive to provide so called affordable housing be resulting in poor ill-considered design and poor material choice. What controls can be implemented - to control ad-hock building of poorly designed faceless blocks? What incentives can be inserted to encourage builders to create attractive buildings that address the street and thereby maintain Nelson's community spirit. Is this excessive interference from Council and who defines what is within the rules? Economy of build does not lead to poor design.	Accept in part	Section 12
4419	S934.008	Nicholas Priest	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise development of brownfield and underdeveloped sites in the city and city fringe before developing in existing residential areas.	Is it necessary to plan to invade the streets of nelson with the potential to build ugly flats. There is plenty of brown site, or underdeveloped sites in the city and city fringes. There is a huge amount of spare land in Nelson and this surely can be used for development?	Accept in part	Section 12
4420	S934.010	Nicholas Priest	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Encourage use of timber as a primary building material [inferred].	Can Nelson choose to impose use of timber as a primary build material? (this of course does fit with the 'green agenda').	Reject	Section 13
4421	S934.011	Nicholas Priest	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Incentivise landowners and developers to build [inferred].	There is a huge amount of spare land in Nelson and this surely can be used for development? Who owns it and can they be persuaded to build? Of course, they will build if Central Government stops its socialist tendencies and encourages free trade and the opportunity for developers to see an opening into which they can invest with a long-term horizon to realise their investment. E.g., If rent control looks like they will be implemented businessmen are not going to invest. Central government attempted to build 100,000 homes they failed. Privateers are the ones to do the work/build if the playing field is set correctly. Encouraging outfits such as simplicity to build and they will if the incentive is there to do it. If the correct 'rules' are in place they will build to a standard and style required and will often join in with the community of the relationship is established.	Accept in part	Section 13
4422	S935.004	Boffa Miskell Ltd (Nelson) (WITHDRAWN SUBMISSION 12Feb2024)	Mapping	Amend	The area of The Broads area [corner of Franklyn and Vanguard Streets] should also be included in intensification with the anticipated Nelson Hospital redevelopment.	Refer to reasons in submission point S935.001.	Reject	Section 12
4423	S935.005	Boffa Miskell Ltd (Nelson) (WITHDRAWN SUBMISSION 12Feb2024)	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Intensification should also be considered in local centres Tahuna and Stoke.	These urban centres already have key transport and infrastructure capacity needed for intensified living in Nelson. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
4424	S935.006	Boffa Miskell Ltd (Nelson) (WITHDRAWN SUBMISSION 12Feb2024)	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Areas within the Nelson Port/Marina should be considered as focal points for intensification.	Areas within the Nelson Port/Marina should be considered as focal points for intensification as there is existing transport infrastructure.	Reject	Section 12
4425	S935.007	Boffa Miskell Ltd (Nelson) (WITHDRAWN SUBMISSION 12Feb2024)	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Develop an urban greenspace spatial plan to enable successful intensification outcomes PC29.	Refer to reasons in submission point S935.002.	Reject	Section 13
4426	S936.004	Susan Lovell	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 submission point S936.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
4427	S936.006	Susan Lovell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S936.001 and S936.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
4428	S936.007	Susan Lovell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4429	S936.008	Susan Lovell	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13

4430	S936.009	Susan Lovell	Residential Zones	Amend	Suggests building high rise apartment buildings towards the foothills where they wont stick out.	I would be financially and environmentally disadvantages by this plan. I have recently acquired [a] property and now have a drop in value, inability to plan, and a high risk rise of losing sun and privacy. Eisel Park, [the] adjoining recreational reserve, and the foothills are enjoyed by locals and visitors and the overall enjoyment would be ruined by a high rise building. e.g. parking increases, privacy, sun/shading, views.	Reject	Section 10
4431	S937.001	Caroline Thompson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Start [intensification] within the Central City [using] the $36 million from central government (IAF) as the starting point to encourage land & building owners in the central city to adopt the PC 29 High Density principals.	I am not an urban design specialist, but from a ratepayer, resident & enjoyer of Nelson 'the smart little city', the $36 million from central government (IAF) should be the starting point for regenerating Nelson. It would be better to use this to encourage land & building owners in the central city to adopt the PC 29High Density principals, a win, win, win as they can tap into the improved infrastructure, more people will move into the central city & NCC will receive more rates. It then gives time to properly consider how a more considered approach to intensification of Nelson can take place. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
4432	S937.002	Caroline Thompson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Proactively consult on & plan for cohesive, functioning neighbourhoods & provide the infrastructure accordingly.	The NCC planning representatives have emphasised that a 'range of residential buildings' would be considered under the proposed PC 29 rules. These would be built: i. when a property becomes available ii.depending on whether the building meets the PC 29 rules, but if so without any notification or consenting process iii. On an ongoing basis without any timeline, so no end to buildings being erected in sight. There are several issues to this planning strategy. An ad hoc approach lends itself to a disjointed aesthetic effect, diminishing any residual character, of which Nelson has much & why many people move here. This would be further reduced by the height/daylight hours rules impacting on residents' abilities to install solar panels, grow vegetables for example. A 3 storey building just by its nature will cast shade over neighbouring properties when so close to the boundary. If PC 29 had a timeline (a beginning & an end) Council, developers & residents would have more clarity. Having no timeline & no ability to anticipate where the next development will be under the PC 29 process means that residents will be always anticipating disruption & material impacts on their lives, leading to a reduction in the wellbeing of the community in general. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 13
4433	S937.003	Caroline Thompson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	[Amend PC29 based on] the most up to date figures from Stats NZ to be released in February 2024.	The process adopted by NCC to the proposed implementation of PC 29 has been broadbrush & reactive. One of the 'Key Drivers' of PC 29 is the projected growth in Nelson's population based on Statistics New Zealand figures. However, the most up to date figures from Stats NZ will be released in February 2024. Surely NCC would want to base such an important urban design change on the most accurate figures available?	Reject	Section 10
4434	S937.004	Caroline Thompson	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Oppose Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 in its entirety.	It appears that the Nelson City Council does not place value on communities already existing & operating organically within the General, Medium density & High density residential areas proposed under PC29. Imposing general rules on areas without a valid social assessment that considers the existing social amenities & relationships will lead to fragmentation & resentment. The effects of this leads to reduced support between neighbours, a reduced sense of security for children & the elderly & development of an 'us & them' mentality.	Reject	Section 9
4435	S939.004	Era and Darryl Creevey	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 S939.001.	Accept in part	Section 12

4436	S939.006	Era and Darryl Creevey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S939.001 and S939.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
4437	S939.007	Era and Darryl Creevey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4438	S939.008	Era and Darryl Creevey	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
4439	S939.009	Era and Darryl Creevey	Residential Zones	Oppose	Build [houses] on land outside of the heavy/dense residential area - [suggests] outskirts or empty/unused land.	Not stated.	Accept in part	Section 12
4440	S941.001	Peter Kortegast and Sue Ware	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject Plan Change 29.	We reject the Plan change 29 outright and want to have input in any modified version of the plan. But if Council were to consider this change, we request the following matters are considered: 1. [refer to reasons in submission point S941.002] 2. [refer to reasons in submission point S941.003] 3. [refer to reasons in submission point S941.002] 4. [refer to reasons in submission point S941.002] 5. We do not understand the need for Nelson to grow its population by the extent predicted by the regional growth strategy. It seems at odds with the Council declaring a climate change emergency. Population growth is a main cause of climate change and large increases in population should be encouraged in existing large cities not regional centres like Nelson. 6. [refer to reasons in submission point S941.005] 7. [refer to reasons in submission point S941.004].	Reject	Section 9
4441	S941.002	Peter Kortegast and Sue Ware	Mapping	Oppose in part	Remove Mount Street from category 2 housing zoning [Medium Density Residential Zone].	Mount Street has historic character timber housing and [should be considered as a] heritage precinct.... These character housing areas are what makes Nelson a beautiful urban place to live. We recommend the character of Mount St is preserved and it removed from category 2 housing zoning. Mount Street has a land instability overlay. As the majority of sections have steep gradients. We have a history of land movements and slips in our area. Mount Street is not a suitable area for housing intensification... The roading infrastructure is narrow, has non-standard horizontal curves, steep vertical gradients and a historic speeding issue. We have little to no footpaths and poor street lighting... Our roading infrastructure is not suited to support category 2 housing intensification. Mount Street is a prominent ridge line and is key feature of both the church hill area and Vanguard Valley. If 3 story housing was permitted along the Mount St ridge line then this would have a dramatic effect on the visual character of Nelson. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept in part	Section 12
4442	S941.005	Peter Kortegast and Sue Ware	Residential Zones	Oppose	Provide low cost affordable housing and intensification with apartments in the City Centre, The Wood and flat land in the City Fringe.	If Nelson City wants to provide lower cost affordable housing in Nelson we recommend that Council looks to The City Centre, The Wood and flat land in the City Fringe. The Council should improve the Maitai Flood bank protections. This has been modelled and designed, but was stopped by the Nelson City Parks & Reserves Department, as it was unwilling to remove the river side trees. This is small sacrifice and cost to make to protect our city from ever increasing risk of sea level rise and high intensity climate uncertainty rain events. With this flood protection a vibrant City centre and nearby city fringe can be intensified with apartments and is the appropriate place for this. Not steep hill land like Mount St.	Reject	Section 12

4443	S942.001	Alec Woods	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Reject PC29 and request thatthe Council's planners go back to the drawing board and come up with a planthat better reflects the wishes ofNelson residents, as opposed to those of property developers.	There is an element of undue haste about the way public consultation on PC29 has been carried out. There seems to be considerable disagreement about how fast the city will grow and where this growth will occur. Once the ink is dry on Plan Change 29 we are going to have to live with it for a very long time so it's important that we get it right. We live in a time of much uncertainly and so plan changes should be incremental and made with the precautionary principle in mind. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Section 9
4444	S942.002	Alec Woods	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Support increasing the housing stock through intensification (both in-filling and building up) rather than losing more productive rural land to large housing estates.	Not stated.	Accept in part	Section 12
4445	S943.004	Louise Francis	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 submission point S943.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
4446	S943.006	Louise Francis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Prioritise housing growth and intensification within the Inner City, before the current residential zones.	Refer to reasons in submission points S943.001 and S943.004 above.	Accept in part	Section 12
4447	S943.007	Louise Francis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Appoint an independent Panel to hear the Submissions.	Not stated.	Reject	Section 11
4448	S943.008	Louise Francis	Entire Plan Change	Oppose	Extend the closing date for submissions.	I ACKNOWLEDGE that I have found it extremely difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation of over 2,000 pages.	Reject	Section 13
4449	S943.009	Louise Francis	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Suggests the Council acquire tracks of bare land that are more spacious and build these 'villages' there - SH6 in hope, further north of Atawhai. Not the Maitai area.	It is simply immoral to impact the home values and quality of life of people who have spent years acquiring and maintaining their houses. Not only that but there are problems around increased traffic, noise and congestion.	Accept in part	Section 13
4450	S944.001	Habitat for Humanity Nelson	Entire Plan Change	Support	Strengthen qualitative controls and standards to ensure that the resulting outcomes are of good quality, and that affordable housing is actually provided.	Affordable housing isn't solely about the initial purchase or rental price of a home. It encompasses the overall affordability of living, including heating and cooling, maintenance, and the costs of commuting to work, education, employment and services. Affordable living becomes more attainable when homes are centrally located. Habitat Nelson supports PC29's intention to intensify housing supply in and around our primary urban areas and hope that this will expand housing options and supply, including the availability of development opportunities for Community Housing Providers. Creating a wide range of centrally located housing options for people of all income groups and abilities is essential for building an equitable and inclusive city. We commend Nelson City Council for recognising that promoting affordable housing involves not only increasing housing supply but also creating a regulatory environment that encourages affordable development. Streamlining regulations, offering incentives, and fostering partnerships with Community Housing Providers are proactive steps in this direction.	Accept in part	Section 12
4451	S944.003	Habitat for Humanity Nelson	Entire Plan Change	Support	The quality of life for both residents and neighbours should be prioritised in the development process, ensuring that new developments do not compromise the overall well-being of the community.	Refer to reasons in submission point S944.001.	Accept in part	Section 12

4452	S944.004	Habitat for Humanity Nelson	Entire Plan Change	Support	Developer incentives for the redevelopment of existing urban areas should target inclusivity and affordability. Incentives could include a fast-tracked consent processes, discounts or waivers for council fees, and coordination and funding for related infrastructure upgrades.	Refer to reasons in submission point S944.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
4453	S944.005	Habitat for Humanity Nelson	Entire Plan Change	Support	Support intensification in and around primary urban areas to expand housing options and supply, including the availability of development opportunities or Community Housing Providers.	Refer to reasons in submission point S944.001.	Accept in part	Section 12
4454	FS38.045	Small Time Developments		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Support intensification in and around primary urban areas to expand housing options and supply, including the availability of development opportunities or Community Housing Providers. Specifically supporting Community Housing Providers will enhance the range of choices for people and support affordability.	Accept in Part	Section 12
4455	S946.001	Sarah and Christian	Entire Plan Change	Support	Accept Plan Change 29.	I imagine there are many other young people like myself with busy lives who feel the same - that we are desperate for more housing options, particularly close to the city centre. I appreciate the lengths the council went to to consult the community but worry voices like mine are not heard. I currently live in Auckland with my partner but we are looking to return to the south Island with Nelson being our first choice. We are mid career professionals (I'm a teacher and he's an infrastructure technician in the public sector) who have been crippled by the cost of housing here. We are active in our community (volunteer with a local conservation organisation, in sports clubs, support local businesses) but the issues created by urban sprawl and unaffordable housing have forced us to look at cutting these ties and moving away. We implore the council to consider people like us who want the chance to move to Nelson and contribute to the city as we have done in Auckland. The availability of affordable housing remains our most important issue.	Accept in part	Section 9
4456	FS38.046	Small Time Developments		Support in part	Accept in part	The particular parts of the submission we support in part are: Accept Plan Change 29. While there are aspects of Plan Change 29 that we disagree with, we agree with the submitter that affordable housing, including a variety of housing options, is an important issue to address.	Accept in part	Section 9