Hearing Panel PC29 – 4 September 2024

Sarah Holman - Submitter #617

I appreciate the opportunity to be heard.

General

- Agree some level of intensification required
- I'm not anti-development, I qualified as a Chartered Surveyor specialising in development
- I believe intensification should be staged, sensitive to the assets our community values, and commensurate with need and local demand for housing
- Nelson needs high value employment opportunities, these are influenced by the creativity of the population, the character of Nelson, community, current amenities, and built and natural heritage
- Nelson has a strong sense of community; PC 29 isn't a proposed solution that has been developed with the community

I support

- MDZ intensification in the Inner City Centre and Inner City Fringe zones **only,** if subject to an overall design guide
- Removal of heritage category C and proposal to replace with a two tier ranking system
- The proposed Richmond Avenue heritage precinct
- Adaptive reuse measures for listed heritage properties e.g. solar, earthquake strengthening

Others will cover topics I'm concerned about in a more expert way:

- Daylight and other requirements
- Heritage assessment criteria
- Population statistics
- Heritage registers
- Infrastructure requirements as a result of PC 29 proposals
- Daylight angles and other amenity protections etc

Key points:

1) Inadequate time to respond to proposal of this magnitude
    - Very large change proposed, beyond that envisaged by FDS. Limited community engagement prior to notification.
    - Depth of feeling (mostly against it) witnessed by Trafalgar Centre meeting 7 September 2023 – about 700 people attended and listened to each other respectfully, whatever their view. Proof of strength of our community.
    - Many of community who engaged with this process feel disaffected and unheard – many submissions rejected, people don't feel it is worth submitting or appearing.
    - In my view generic template submissions should be taken seriously – they are in effect petitions, this is complex proposal and the documentation is extensive. Many people grouped together to help each other understand the proposal and process.
    - In my opinion it is not the community's job to ensure that errors are corrected, or to provide examples – that is the job of the experts putting together the proposed Plan Change.

2) Lost opportunity

- More extensive community consultation could have led to innovative collaborative solutions, it still could
- So many talented creative people here, a desire for neighbourhood planning (strength of community – self organised street groups and meetings. e.g. What If Whakatū Nelson[1]
- Nelson's point of difference is its culture and heritage: potential economic consequences. Culture and heritage boost wealth of towns: https://www.theguardian.com/culture/article/2024/aug/11/invest-heritage-boost-wealth-english-towns-historic-england?CMP=Share_iOSApp_Other

  "This report reveals what has been suspected for a long time – that there is a tangible link between historic places and increased creativity and economic activity," Neil Mendoza, chair of Historic England and chair of the government's culture and heritage capital programme, told the Observer. "It demonstrates that the heritage that surrounds us and belongs to us all has a positive, significant effect on artistic creativity as well as a positive impact on scientific creativity. It makes sense, because we know that heritage is a catalyst for regeneration. It boosts local pride and it makes people feel good – 93% of people agree that local heritage raises their quality of life."

  Mendoza believes the wider implications are just as clear. "The results show how important our built heritage really is as a magnet for creative industries, and how much it brings to the table,"

2) Scope of Proposal disproportionate to need

- This level of intensification is not required as a Tier 2 council under NPS Urban Growth
- Population growth has been overstated:

c) Informed by the evidence of Mr McIlrath, the increase in heights and densities proposed will provide at least sufficient development capacity that will exceed projected demand over the next 30 years. Providing increased opportunities for development to occur is a key way in which a more competitive land and development market can be achieved and a means to contributing to improved housing affordability.

- It does not adhere to the precautionary principle
- Developed in isolation from a much-needed overall Plan update
- It is inconsistent with other policy, particularly the Future Development Strategy:

[1] What if Whakatū Nelson... (whatifnelson.co.nz)

- PC 29 does not appear to reflect what the community expected by responding to FDS consultation, key expectation was neighbourhood planning (more nuanced)
- anticipated flexibility in responding to population changes whether up or (population is dependent on political decisions, inwards migration)
- Zoning could be more nuanced –concentric circles reflecting distance from the centre disproportionately affect older areas; neighbourhood planning would consider aged housing stock, values of land (ie areas ripe for development)
- As drafted will result in "pepper potting":

The Proposed Plan Change response to the need for more housing is disproportionate to demand needs. Demand for this level of intensification typology is not established in most of the residential area of Nelson. Reference the Barker & Associate s.32 analysis.

> *The apartment market is not currently well established and is unlikely to experience any significant growth in the short-*term *Even allowing for higher rates of demand substitution and development of this market in the future, there is still a relatively small projected demand.*
>
> *We consider that in some locations the spatial extent of the HDR zone is large relative to the local market size and may result in development that is less integrated with the central node of amenity in the short to medium-term.*

- Definition of Inner City has been extended – people are generally accepting of intensification in the CBD, and there is a market for more intensive housing there

4) <u>Heritage</u>

- Our history and built and natural heritage makes Nelson what it is
- RMA s.6(f) Matter of National Importance:

6 Matters of national importance

In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall recognise and provide for the following matters of national importance:

(a) the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:

(b) the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:

(c) the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna:

(d) the maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes, and rivers:

(e) the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga:

(f) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:

(g) the protection of protected customary rights:

(h) the management of significant risks from natural hazards.

historic heritage—

(a) means those natural and physical resources that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of New Zealand's history and cultures, deriving from any of the following qualities:
  (i) archaeological:
  (ii) architectural:
  (iii) cultural:
  (iv) historic:
  (v) scientific:
  (vi) technological; and

(b) includes—
  (i) historic sites, structures, places, and areas; and
  (ii) archaeological sites; and
  (iii) sites of significance to Māori, including wāhi tapu; and
  (iv) surroundings associated with the natural and physical resources

- Heritage assessments:
  - Brief is constrained (no archaeology despite s.6(f)), limited local input
  - Only part of Nelson reviewed without the consideration of the whole
  - Not best practice, not undertaken by a multidisciplinary team, issues with assessment criteria, no thematic overview
  - "Drive bys "and desk top investigation - not adequate to inform these decisions
- Heritage is a non-renewable resource
- PC 29 does not accord with a sustainable use of existing resources
- Due to the way cities grow, most residential built heritage is closer to the centre and on larger sections – PC29 lack of nuance means that these are most likely to be affected negatively by intensification (not just the number removed or added to the register)

What relief I seek (subset):

- True community engagement, what does the Nelson community want – *What If Whakatū Nelson*, Heart of Nelson
- Neighbourhood planning in consultation with community
- Medium density zoning to be restricted to the Inner City and Inner City Fringe Zones.
- Intensification plans based on regular reviews of the FDS to incrementally provide for intensification if demand is established.
- Development of new intensification plans to be based on:
    - New best practice, peer reviewed, population projections
    - A full economic study of proposed intensification (residential and commercial)
    - Social impact study
    - Qualitative impact assessments (e.g. amenity, character, effect on communities)
    - Sustainability impacts
    - Effect on heritage resources
    - Meeting Council's legal obligations to heritage resources
    - An independent character assessment of Nelson, encompassing listed heritage areas in NRMP
    - Development of a cohesive, design strategy for Nelson
    - Development of neighbourhood spatial plans with the community (referred to in Future Development Strategy but not undertaken before Proposed Plan Change 29 was notified).
- Retain an Inner-City Heritage Precinct, update the design guide.
- Retain the Wakefield Quay Heritage/Character Precinct, update design guide.
- Retain the Church Hill View Shaft.
- Reassess the Fairfield/Nelson South area as a character precinct with additional protections (addressing requests in submissions to the Draft Nelson Plan 2020).

Thank you

Sarah Holman