Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic – Papakāinga

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S198.014	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Papakāinga	Support	Retain [DO1A.2.4] as notified.	Transpower supports this policy [DO1A.2.4 maximum scale of papakāinga development] on the basis that it recognises that the maximum intensity and scale of papakāinga development will be determined by the limitations of the site, which could include the proximity of the site to the National Grid.	Accept in part	Key Issue 1
S198.051	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Residential Zones	Support	Retain [AA.3 Permitted Activity] as notified.	Transpower supports the permitted activity rule for papakāinga on the basis that it requires papakāinga to comply with rule REr.51 (Buildings near National Grid transmission lines).	Accept in part	Key Issue 2
S224.014	Port Nelson Ltd	Papakāinga	Support in part	Amend Schedule AA [in relation to Rule REr.19V - papakāinga development] as follows, plus any consequential amendments required to give effect to this relief: AA.3 Permitted Activity And d. in the General Residential Zone:**v. REr.64 Airport Effects Control Overlay and Port Effects Control Overlay - Minimum Site Area** **vi. REr.65A Port Effects Control Overlay Acoustic insultation of buildings, and** **vii. REr.107 Subdivision**	PNL supports the development of papakāinga housing but seeks to ensure that the relevant minimum size areas and acoustic requirements apply for any papakāinga housing that may be established in the General Residential Zone within the Port Effects Control Overlay, as they currently do in the operative NRMP. This would make Schedule AA consistent with Schedule A in this regard.	Accept	Key Issue 2
S431.001	Bruce Mutton	Papakāinga	Support	Support in principle inclusion of provisions for papkāingadevelopment.	Not stated.	Accept	Key Issue 1
S512.017	Nelson Tasman Climate Forum	Papakāinga	Support	Support papakāinga housing being a permitted scheduledactivity in all zones.	Māori are disproportionately suffering from housing inequity and poverty yet are also significant landowners and have a unique position in Aotearoa as tangata	Accept	Key Issue 2

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					whenua. Making it easier for them to build housing on their own land, in a way that is culturally meaningful for them is essential for redressing the injustices of the past and for becoming a good partner in Te Tiriti.		
S528.003	Greg Hornsby	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Provide for tangata whenua to develop papakāinga housing.	Not stated.	Accept	Key Issue 1
S572.006	Nelson Tasman Housing Trust	Papakāinga	Support	Support iwi and hapū values and aspirations for urban development.	Supporting iwi and hapū values and aspirations for urban development makes good sense.	Accept	Key Issue 1
FS56.080	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support	Accept	Kāinga Ora also has strong support for incorporation of iwi and hapū values and aspirations for urban development into the plan.	Accept	Key Issue 1
S580.019	Small Time Developments	Papakāinga	Support	Support the intention of DO1A Papakainga to provide clearer pathways for Maori to develop papakainga on their ancestral land.	We acknowledge the importance of specifically recognising and providing for the needs of Maori.	Accept	Key Issue 1
FS56.084	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support	Accept	Kāinga Ora supports in principle the provision for collective housing in all residential zones, as a means of enabling housing choice and potentially improved affordability.	Accept	Key Issue 1
S580.020	Small Time Developments	Papakāinga	Support	Support Sch.AA Papakainga development.	We support the intention to provide clearer pathways for Maori to develop papakainga on their ancestral land and acknowledge the importance of specifically recognising and providing for the needs of Maori.	Accept	Key Issue 3
FS56.085	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support	Accept	Kāinga Ora supports in principle the provision for collective housing in all residential zones, as a means of enabling housing choice and potentially improved affordability.	Accept	Key Issue 3
S709.001	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Support the addition of definitions for "cycle parking, Micromobility, Sensitive activities, sustainable addition" and the increase in reference to ngā kupu (Māori words) such as Taonga and Tipuna/tupuna in Chapter 2 Meaning of Words.	Defining the meaning of words allows for a greater shared understanding of words.	Accept	Key Issue 3

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic – Papakāinga

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S709.002	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Entire Plan Change	Amend	Check with mana whenua on the correct placement of macrons for tipuna/tīpuna and tupuna/tūpuna and amend accordingly.	Noted inconsistent use of macrons on tipuna/tīpuna and tupuna/tūpuna. This is potentially problematic as macrons can change a definition.	Reject	Key Issue 3
S709.003	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Papakāinga	Amend	Amend the definition of Treaty of Waitangi as follows:~~Treaty of Waitangi (~~Te Tiriti o Waitangi~~*)~~ **- refers to the Māori text of te Tiriti o Waitangi as the legal doctrine of contra proferentem.** ~~has the same meaning as the word 'Treaty' as defined in section 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975.~~And consequentially adopt the amended definition throughout the plan.	NPHS-NM noted the definition of the Treaty of Waitangi: Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi*) has the same meaning as the word 'Treaty' as defined in section 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975. Section 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975 refers to both to 'Te Tiriti o Waitangi' (Te Tiriti) and the 'Treaty of Waitangi' (The Treaty). It is deeply problematic to use the term the Treaty of Waitangi to refer to both Te Tiriti (Māori text) and the Treaty (the English version). These are two separate documents that say two distinct things: acceptance of the Waitangi Tribunal WAI 1040 (ruling that Ngāpuhi never ceded sovereignty) and the legal doctrine of contra proferentem (recognising the preferred authority of the Māori text); or the contrary position embracing the English version which implies that Māori ceded sovereignty. The new resource management bills refer to te Tiriti o Waitangi as opposed to the Treaty of Waitangi. For example the Natural and Built Environments bill states "All persons exercising powers and performing functions and duties under this Act must give effect to the principles of te Tiriti o Waitangi." NPHS-NM noted in Section 32 Evaluation Report, te Tiriti o Waitangi was used. It is important that the Nelson Resource Management Plan clarifies its positionality regarding Te Tiriti o Waitangi in this chapter (Chapter 2 Meaning of words) and consistently adopts 'Te Tiriti o Waitangi' throughout the plan.	Reject	Key Issue 3

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic – Papakāinga

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S709.007	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Papakāinga	Support in part	Consider working with iwi, hapū and whānau to include a definition of wellbeing/ hauora/ oranga that encapsulates te Ao Māori (Māori word view(s)).	It is important to note that these definitions do not encapsulate te Ao Māori (the Māori world) view(s) of health and wellbeing which is particularly important to achieve Pae Ora (healthy futures). [Refer to the original submission, including Appendix A1 for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 3
S709.017	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Papakāinga	Amend	Amend the district wide objectives and policies [and make consequential changes to other provisions as necessary] to include reference to hapū, for example: DO1.1.2 treaty principles and kaitiakitanga: The Council recognises that mutually satisfactory consultation between iwi, **hapū and Māori** and the Council is necessary to give effect to the principles of **Te Tiriti** ~~the Treaty~~.	NPHS-NM noted there is no reference to hapū under this section of the plan. This is important because hapū and iwi are distinct entities and it is hapū leaders who negotiated and signed Te Tiriti. Hapū need to be recognised as Te Tiriti partners by local government while ensuring all Māori have input into council decision-making. Refer to reasons in submission point S709.003 and the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 3
S709.018	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Papakāinga	Support in part	Support the retention of operative policies • DO1.1.3 management by tāngata whenua. • DO1.1.5 cultural activities.	The existing provision for tangata whenua to have opportunities to manage their ancestral land and resources in a sustainable manner allows for Tino Rangatiratanga (self-determination, authority) which is critical to support the decolonisation of our natural and built environment and work towards pae ora. This provision will enable the necessary growth in kaupapa Māori education and health facilities such as kohanga reo and hauora Māori providers to meet the needs of a growing Māori population and increase provider options for the community.	Reject	Key Issue 1
S709.019	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough,	Papakāinga	Support	Approve all provisions under DO1A - papakāinga in the General, Medium Density, High Density Residential zones, Inner City and Suburban Commercial zones as notified; or with modifications as	The provisions under DO1A seek to reduce the barriers that tāngata whenua face in the development of papakāinga on their ancestral land which gives meaningful effect to article 2 of Te Tiriti, ensuring tino rangatiratanga over their whenua. This is required for	Accept in part	Key Issue 1

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
	Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)			requested by the submitter in other submission points.	genuine decolonisation to occur. The role of housing in enabling people to connect to their tūrangawaewae is important to Māori wellbeing. Papakāinga have the ability to foster wellbeing through providing intergenerational housing that supports the continuation of Māori traditions and culture such as access to mahinga kai, māra, and mātauranga Māori. The ability to pass down knowledge intergenerationally through collective participation in activities that connect whānau to their whenua is vital to a range of cultural outcomes, such as te reo Māori revitalisation. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]		
S709.084	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Papakāinga	Support	Approve (Schedule Sch.AA) and the associated rule REr.19V Papakāinga development - in General, Medium Density, High Density Residential zones.	Support in full - papakāinga in the General, Medium Density, High Density Residential zones, Inner City and Suburban Commercial zones. The application of kaupapa-Māori urban-design principles driven and governed by mana whenua, is important if regeneration projects are to genuinely reflect a localised sense of place and our national commitment to te Tiriti o Waitangi57. The migration of Māori from rural to urban areas in the 20th century has resulted in significant disadvantages for Māori, including lack of employment, inadequate housing, and discrimination58. These processes continue to have negative intergenerational impacts on Māori equity and wellbeing. Oritetanga (Equity), is encompassed in Article 3 of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and requires the Crown to commit to achieving equitable outcomes for Māori. To honour this commitment, public services must address and eliminate the inequities in the determinants of health and wellbeing for iwi, hapū, whānau and Māori communities. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Key Issue 2

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic – Papakāinga

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S709.118	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Suburban Commercial Zone	Support	Approve SCr.20B Papakāinga development.	[Refer to the reasons in submission point S709.019]	Accept	Key Issue 2
S709.162	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Discuss with tangata whenua and Tasman District Council about the development of a Māori Urban Design Framework.	There is no reference to Māori design in this guideline. Tasman District Council plans to work with tangata whenua to develop a Māori Urban Design Framework. This an important tool which could guide how matauranga Māori could be used to enhance cultural connections to the land and tell local stories through the design of buildings, neighbourhoods and parks. [Refer to the original submission appendix A2 - spatial equity for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S732.018	John Fitchett	Papakāinga	Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of "and commercial" in the definition of Papakainga In relation to the Residential zones, the inclusion of the words "and commercial" in DOIA.2.5 and where ever they appear in relation to Papakainga, including proposed schedule AA Papakāinga development - General, Medium and High Density Residential zones.	Residential zones are in general not appropriate for commercial uses ancillary to papakainga. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 3
FS83.177	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	Key Issue 3
S732.019	John Fitchett	Papakāinga	Oppose	[Identify on the planning maps] specific properties said to be "Ancestral land" relevant to Papakainga.	I oppose the absence of identification of land said to be "ancestral", being land that could be used for papakainga in a residential zone. Residents in residential zones should be able to ascertain from the Planning Documents if there is "ancestral land " (or other land) in the neighbourhood - that could be used in future for papakainga. Noting the current lengthy litigation relating to the Nelson Tenths, this is particularly relevant.	Reject	Key Issue 1

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					[Refer to the original submission for more detail]		
FS83.178	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	Key Issue 1
S732.020	John Fitchett	Papakāinga	Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of general title land in AA.4 [Restrict Discretionary activities in proposed Schedule AA Papakāinga in the General, Medium and High Density Residential zones].	Not stated.	Reject	Key Issue 2
FS83.179	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	Key Issue 2
S732.021	John Fitchett	Papakāinga	Oppose	Oppose the provision in AA.4 [Restricted Discretionary activities in proposed Schedule AA Papakāinga in the General, Medium and High Density Residential zones] that decisions will be made without public notification.	Not stated.	Reject	Key Issue 2
FS83.180	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	Key Issue 2
S732.022	John Fitchett	Papakāinga	Oppose	Oppose discretionary resource consents for papakainga on general title land in AA.5 [Discretionary activities in proposed Schedule AA Papakāinga in the General, Medium and High Density Residential zones].	Not stated.	Reject	Key Issue 2
FS83.181	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	Key Issue 2
S732.023	John Fitchett	Papakāinga	Oppose	Amend the plan change to reflect opposition to the word "will" in the second line of AA.6.c. [As follows: For resource consent	Not stated.	Reject	Key Issue 2

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				applications under this Schedule AA, Council will seek advice from any relevant iwi authority and will rely on this advice. The matters that Council ~~will~~ seek advice from iwi authorities on include any matter related to tikanga Māori].			
FS83.182	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	Key Issue 2
S732.024	John Fitchett	Papakāinga	Oppose	Give residents/entities not identifiable as Maori the right to develop property in the nature of papakainga.	Not stated.	Reject	Key Issue 2
FS83.183	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	Key Issue 2
S732.025	John Fitchett	Papakāinga	Oppose	[Remove] the inclusion of mandatory reliance on the relevant iwi authority for advice as set out in Advice Note after DOIA.2.6.	I oppose the the inclusion of mandatory reliance on the relevant iwi authority for advice as set out in Advice Note after DOIA.2.6. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 2
FS83.184	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	Key Issue 2
S732.050	John Fitchett	Papakāinga	Oppose	Amend the plan change to reflect opposition to the last 22 words of [District wide policy] DOIA.2.4 [maximum scale of papakāinga development, which states: that papakāinga may contain activities of a character, scale, intensity or range that are not provided for in the surrounding area].	Not stated.	Reject	Key Issue 1
FS83.211	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	Key Issue 1

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic – Papakāinga

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S879.012	Tasman District Council	Papakāinga	Support	Retain the [REr.19V and Schedule AA] provisions.	TDC supports the enablement of papakainga activities in residential zones.	Accept	Key Issue 2
S879.013	Tasman District Council	Papakāinga	Support	Retain papakainga definition as notified [inferred].	The definition provided in Chapter 2 for papakainga is supported.	Accept	Key Issue 3
S896.001	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Papakāinga	Support	Retain new/amended definitions of'ancestral land', 'ancillaryactivity', 'commercialactivity', 'general title land','Maori land', 'Papakāinga',and 'taonga'.	These definitions support tangata whenua iwi, hapū and whānau in the development of their communally owned land in ways that allow traditional patterns of use. This enables the maintenance of culture and traditions and provides for the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of tangata whenua iwi, hapū and whānau.	Accept	Key Issue 3
S896.002	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Papakāinga	Support in part	Amend the new definition of 'Tipuna/tupuna' to read: "Tipuna/tupuna means (in relation to papakāinga in the General, Medium Density and High Density Residential zones, Inner City and Suburban Commercial zones) ancestors, **grandparents**."	The definition is generally supported but should be expanded to include grandparents for clarity. [Refer to the] definition in Te Aka | Māori Dictionary.	Reject	Key Issue 3
S896.003	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Papakāinga	Support in part	Amend Objective Do1A.1 - Papakāinga are a taonga to read: "To provide for traditional papakāinga, which are a taonga that: a. Empower and enable tangata whenua to live on their ancestral land; b. Provide for ~~tangata whenua to maintain and enhance their traditional and cultural relationship with their ancestral land~~ **the maintenance of culture and traditions**; c. **Provide for the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of tangata whenua**, and	This objective is largely supported as it provides for the protection and enhancement of the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of Te Tauihu tangata whenua iwi. Some wording changes are suggested to reflect the wider dimensions of papa kāinga and to enhance readability. It is noted that DO1A.1.4 relates specifically to connection with ancestral land.	Accept	Key Issue 1

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				d. Are developed and used in accordance with tikanga Māori, while recognising that papakāinga may develop their own tikanga.			
S896.004	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Papakāinga	Support	Retain wording of Objective DO1A.1.2 Kia ora te mauri o te whanau (Māori living as Māori). Add macron to 'whānau' in the objective heading.	This objective provides for the protection and enhancement of the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of Te Tauihu tangata whenua iwi, hapū and whānau.	Accept	Key Issue 1
S896.005	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Papakāinga	Support	Retain Objective DO1A.1.3 Provide for the sustained occupation of ancestral land.	This objective provides for the protection and enhancement of the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of both current and future generations of Te Tauihu tangata whenua iwi, hapū and whānau.	Accept	Key Issue 1
S896.006	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Papakāinga	Support	Retain Objective DO1A.1.4 Provide for the development of land owned by tangata whenua.	This objective recognises the cultural connection between tangata whenua and their ancestral land and allows for the maintenance of those connections.	Accept	Key Issue 1
S896.007	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Papakāinga	Support	Retain Objective DO1A.1.5 Working in partnership with tangata whenua to exercise tino rangatiratanga.	This objective provides for the exercise of tino rangatiratanga.	Accept	Key Issue 1
S896.008	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Papakāinga	Amend	Amend Objective DO1A.1.6 Increasing the visibility of tangata whenua through the design of papakāinga to read: "**To provide for papa kāinga design that is led by tangata whenua and guided by tikanga Māori.** ~~To increase the visibility of tangata whenua through papakāinga design that is led by tangata whenua and guided by tikanga Māori"~~	Suggest rewording to place emphasis on the objective of providing for papa kāinga design led by tangata whenua and guided by tikanga Māori. This is supported by policy DO1A2.2.	Accept	Key Issue 1

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				Include consequent amendments to objective heading.			
S896.009	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Papakāinga	Support	Retain Objective D01A.1.7 - Implementing Te Ao Māori and demonstrating kaitiakitanga in papakāinga development.	This objective provides for design, development and use of land that supports the protection and enhancement of the mauri of wider natural and physical resources.	Accept	Key Issue 1
S896.010	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Papakāinga	Support	Retain Policy DO1A.2.1 - providing for papakāinga on Māori owned land.	This policy allows for papakāinga on both land in general title and on land held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993. Given the relatively low proportion of land in Nelson City held under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act, the enablement of papa kāinga on general land is vital to meaningful provision of papa kāinga development.	Accept	Key Issue 1
S896.011	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Papakāinga	Support in part	Amalgamate Policy DO1A.2.2 - papakāinga to be led by tangata whenua with policy DO1A.2.3 with new wording to read:**The location, extent, design and development of papakāinga, including extensions to existing papakāinga, will be led by tangata whenua, guided by kaupapa Māori and in accordance with tikanga.**	This policy is supported as it allows for the design and development of papa kāinga to be led by tangata whenua in accordance with their own tikanga. However, it is quite similar to policy DO1A.2.3 - it is suggested that these two policies be amalgamated.	Accept	Key Issue 1
S896.012	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Papakāinga	Support in part	Reword Policy DO1A.2.4 - maximum scale of papakāinga development to: The maximum intensity and scale of papakāinga development will be determined by the limitations of the site, including: a. Adequate provision of on-site infrastructure to serve the papakāinga; and b. ~~Adverse effects on~~ **The extent to which** adverse effects on adjoining properties and the	Support the intent of this objective but rewording (b) will make it clearer that effects of the activity on adjoining properties need to be considered within the context of the plan, including the Zone in which the activity is located and the permitted activity rules for papakāinga.	Accept	Key Issue 1

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated, **while recognising that papakāinga may contain activities of a character, scale, intensity or range that are not provided for in the surrounding area.**~~While recognising that papakāinga may contain activities of a character, scale, intensity or range that are not provided for in the surrounding area.~~			
S896.013	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Papakāinga	Support	Retain Policy DO1A.2.5 - nonresidential aspects of papakāinga.	This policy recognises the wider aspects of traditional papakāinga.	Accept	Key Issue 1
S896.014	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Papakāinga	Amend	Reword Policy DO1A.2.6 - papakāinga design guides and development plans to: The Council will support tangata whenua where tangata whenua choose to prepare papakāinga design guidelines **and implement them through development plans**.~~Tangata whenua will be encouraged to prepare development plans for papakāinga that are consistent with any relevant papakāinga design guides~~	This policy is supported, but suggest rewording for readability.	Accept	Key Issue 1
S896.015	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Residential Zones	Support	Retain Rule REr.19V - papakāinga development in General, Medium Density, High Density Residential zones (Sch.AA).	This rule provides for the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of Te Tauihu tangata whenua iwi, hapū and whānau.	Accept	Key Issue 2

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic – Papakāinga

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S896.016	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Residential Zones	Amend	Retain Schedule AA Papakāinga development - General, Medium and High Density Residential zone, with additions to Assessment Criteria AA.6: (c) For resource consent applications considered under this Schedule AA, the Council will seek advice from the relevant iwi authority and will rely on this advice. The matters that Council will seek advice from iwi authorities on include **whakapapa or ancestral connection to the land** and any **other relevant** matter related to tikanga Māori.	This schedule provides for the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of Te Tauihu tangata whenua whenua iwi, hapū and whānau. Change to assessment criteria suggested to more fully implement advice note 1 contained in DO1A Papakāinga in the General, Medium and High Density Residential zones, Inner City and Suburban Commercial zones.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S896.017	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Inner City and City Fringe Zones	Support	Retain Rule ICr.55B - Papakāinga development, with addition to Assessment Criteria IC55B.4: (c) For resource consent applications under ICr.55B the Council will seek advice from the relevant iwi authority and will rely on this advice. The matters that Council will seek advice from iwi authorities on include **whakapapa or ancestral connection to the land** and any **other relevant** matter related to tikanga Māori.	This rule provides for the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of Te Tauihu tangata whenua whenua iwi, hapū and whānau. Change to assessment criteria suggested to more fully implement advice note 1 contained in DO1A Papakāinga in the General, Medium and High Density Residential zones, Inner City and Suburban Commercial zones.	Accept	Key Issue 2
S896.018	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Suburban Commercial Zone	Support	Retain Rule SCr.20B Papakāinga development with addition to Assessment Criteria SCr20B.4: (c) For resource consent applications under SCr.20B the Council will seek advice from the relevant iwi authority and will rely on this advice. The matters that Council will seek advice from iwi authorities on include **whakapapa or**	This rule provides for the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of Te Tauihu tangata whenua whenua iwi, hapū and whānau. Change to assessment criteria suggested to more fully implement advice note 1 contained in DO1A Papakāinga in the General, Medium and High Density Residential zones, Inner City and Suburban Commercial zones.	Accept	Key Issue 2

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				ancestral connection to the land and any **other relevant** matter related to tikanga Māori.			
S896.019	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Papakāinga	Support in part	Ngāti Rārua supports in part proposed Plan Change 29.	Refer to reasons in submission points S896.001 - S896.018 and the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue 1
S896.020	Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Rārua	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Ngāti Rārua supports Proposed Plan Change 29 provisions that provide for papakāinga.	These proposed changes recognise the interests of tangata whenua as Treaty partners. Provisions enabling the development of new papa kāinga in Whakatū are fundamental to recognising the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands (Section 6(e) RMA) and enabling them to exercise kaitiakitanga over their land and resources (Section 7(a) RMA). The proposed provisions will support tangata whenua iwi, hapū and whānau in the development of their communally owned land in ways that allow traditional patterns of use. In turn, this enables the maintenance of culture and traditions and provides for the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of current and future generations of tangata whenua iwi, hapū and whānau.	Accept	Key Issue 1
S933.016	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Papakāinga	Support	Retain section [DO1] as notified.	Kainga Ora supports the proposed provisions within section [DO1 Tangata Whenua].	Accept	Key Issue 1
S933.017	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Papakāinga	Support	Retain section [DO1A] as notified.	Kainga Ora supports the proposed provisions within section [DO1A Papakainga in the GRZ, MRZ, HRZ, Inner City and Suburban Commercial Zones].	Accept in part	Key Issue 1
S933.089	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support	Retain rule [REr.19V] framework as notified.	Kainga Ora supports this rule [REr.19V Papakainga development (Schedule Sch. AA)] framework in its entirety.	Accept	Key Issue 2
S933.100	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Inner City and City Fringe Zones	Support	Retain [ICr.55B] rule as notified.	Kainga Ora supports [ICr.55B] papakainga development within the Inner City Zone.	Accept	Key Issue 2

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic – Papakāinga

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S933.106	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Suburban Commercial Zone	Support	Retain rule [SCr.20B Papakainga Development] as notified.	Kainga Ora support the enablement of papakainga within the Commercial Zone.	Accept	Key Issue 2
S947.010	Nelson City Council	Papakāinga	Support in part	Ensure the definitions relating to papakāinga align with the Te Ture Whenua Maori Act 1993 where necessary and appropriate.	It is necessary to ensure that the definitions for papakāinga are clear and able to be efficiently administered by the Council.	Accept	Key Issue 3
FS57.0010	Susan Hamilton and David Macdonald		Support in part	Accept	The submission details "the potential adverse effects of taller buildings on the function around amenity of public open spaces" - these include "shading of publicly accessible areas and wild effects". If it is of value to protect public reserves that are used intermittently and by choice, then it is vastly more important to protect privately owned residential properties that are lived in and enjoy the current sunshine and environment 24/7.	Accept	Key Issue 3

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S3.024	Stephanie Gray	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S3.025	Stephanie Gray	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S3.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S14.001	Lisa Wakelin	Transport	Support in part	Consider more playground equipment - specifically 2 swings together (1 baby seat 1 normal seat) or 1 slide - in random places in the proposed purple areas.	I have [young] kids. We have just started taking the bus regularly and the only downside is the lack of seats to wait for half an hour for the bus. To alleviate kids boredom waiting and often standing (because we give up seats for elderly) it'd be great to have what an outlet close by that they could have fun while waiting. There's nothing worse than trying to keep kids entertained while waiting for public transport. It's also a life saver to have a wee place for kids to entertain themselves while adults shop. Since the plan removes the need for any off street parking to residents, I'm assuming less people will be driving & more people using public transport. Wellington has wonderful examples of very bright colourful playground equipment randomly dotted around high density areas.	Reject	Key Issue 1
S19.002	Mike Ball	Transport	Neutral	Consider where [households] are going to park [cars] and how they are going to charge it.	Is there any requirement to provide parking? Although it would be great for people to drive less, most households are still going to own ONE car for the foreseeable future, so we need to consider where they are going to park it, and probably how they are going to charge it.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S19.003	Mike Ball	Transport	Neutral	[Consider provisions to] ensure that at least some of these houses are accessible for those with reduced mobility or needing to use a wheelchair.	If we are going to build taller, what provisions will there be to ensure that at least some of these houses are accessible for those with reduced mobility or needing to use a wheelchair? This problem may be compounded by the fact buildings may well need to be raised in order to reduce the risk from flooding. We already have a problem in this area which is only going to get worse as the population ages.	Reject	Key Issue 6
S24.003	Richard Russell	Transport	Oppose in part	Mandatory provision of at least one off street car park per dwelling.	To address traffic congestion, particularly with the Matai subdivision appearing to be coming on the horizon, there should be a mandatory requirement for provision of at least one off street park per dwelling.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S26.026	Eddie Allnutt	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S26.030.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S26.030	Eddie Allnutt	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S26.044	Eddie Allnutt	Transport	Oppose in part	Retain the vehicle access requirements for all sites [inferred].	There is no public transport [on the Mount Street Hill]. Walk-on only access is unsuitable in wet, cold or windy weather. Driving up and down very steep driveways is challenging at best and potentially unsafe. Provision for vehicles to pass each other would be essential on driveways serving multiple dwellings and would widen the accessways significantly. 3.3 Drive on access is also necessary for shopping trips, and deliveries or removals of larger items and many other aspects of ordinary life. The transition to electric cars will take away any feelings of guilt about car ownership and usage in a relatively short time. 3.4 Emergency services. Ambulances and police need fast, door to door access, not steep walk on access. Fire appliances can accommodate only limited access distance from the street.	Reject	Key Issue

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					[Refer to the original submission for more detail]		
S42.025	Mary Bronsteter	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S42.026	Mary Bronsteter	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S42.025.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S52.028	Gloria Lines	Transport	Oppose in part	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S52.029	Gloria Lines	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. Eg. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S52.028.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S54.006	Pauline Warne	Transport	Not Stated	[Amend] to ensure one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be rezoned.	Refer to reasons in submission point S54.005.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S60.033	Dan McGuire	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S60.034	Dan McGuire	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S60.033.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S60.042	Dan McGuire	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.			
S62.013	Beverly Sellers	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	There is an assumption that, because the high-density zones are within walking distance of the city centre, those living in up to six-storey blocks will have less need for a vehicle to get around--and improved public transport is being promised as demand for these residences grows. The truth is, Aotearoa New Zealand does not have readily accessible rail and bus networks, so local residents will still need a vehicle to drive anywhere outside of the city. Yes, they may use the vehicle less if they can walk into town, but they are still likely to own one for trips to the supermarket, larger purchases or when going on holiday or visiting friends and relations around the country. New Zealanders are being encouraged to buy EVs, but where will they park them under this plan? There certainly won't be room on what are currently lower density residential streets. Additionally, traffic in and out of Whakatū Nelson via Richmond is already at gridlock during peak hours. How will this not become worse with the intensification of the city when we all know it takes years to get new road networks approved and built? A strategic approach to infill housing must encompass infrastructure provision, particularly public and private transport systems. The term 'critical mass' is often referred to in terms of the necessary population increase to enhance public transport, service and business facilities. Just what level can be considered critical mass is not defined, however. If population thresholds aren't reached, the negative impacts of infill housing may be experienced without any positive ones to balance them out.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S63.002	Vivian Sellers	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S63.006	Vivian Sellers	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development There is an assumption that, because the high-density zones are within walking distance of the city centre, those living in up to six-storey blocks will have less need for a vehicle to get around--and improved public transport is being promised as demand for these residences grows. A strategic approach to infill housing must encompass infrastructure provision, particularly public and private transport systems.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S63.033	Vivian Sellers	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S63.002.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S75.010	Eliot Sinclair and Partners Ltd	Transport	Oppose in part	Amend REr.107.1(b) to: (a) require compliance with the mandatory matters in the Nelson Tasman Land Development Manual 2020 excluding 4.10 of Chapter 4 -Transport, and (b) for sites providing vehicular access, require compliance with the mandatory matters of 4.10 Chapter 4 - Transport of the Nelson Tasman Land Development Manual 2020,	In part opposes wording for REr.107.2 (b) which requires all subdivisions to comply with the Mandatory Matters in the Nelson Tasman Land Development Manual 2020. The reason for the opposition is that this document includes Chapter 4-Transport mandatory to provide vehicle to the site. This does not fit with the other standards proposed to allow micromobility access to site as an alternative. Therefore, this rule should be changed to allow access via micromobility.	Accept	Key Issue 6
S77.003	Tracy Manning	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the] rules to ensure that at least one car park is provided for each	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be rezoned.			
S86.002	Hazel Thelin	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development. All residential re-zoning to include parking within each allotment's future development planning requirements.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S87.004	Jane Horder	Entire Plan Change	Support	Ensure green spaces are provided, with walking streets and cycle ways.	Not stated.	Accept	Key Issue 1
S109.009	Joyanne Stevens	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S114.005	Matt Ellery	Transport	Oppose	Ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas proposed to be intensified.	The only option will be to park on the street. This is not a smart solution as our streets are narrow in places (Tosswill Rd, Stansell Ave and Chamberlain for example) and makes passing difficult and unsafe in places already. Adding more roadside cars is only going to increase the risk of accidents. Already on Chamberlain St when cars are parked on the side of the road there are areas where a passing car has to enter the opposite lane to get past. In some cases this is on a blind corner. A highly risky situation. Such situations will only increase if more resident cars are parked in the side of the road. There are also areas that do not have yellow no parking lines on corners and occasionally some car users select to park in these areas. Such unsafe parking will only increase if more residents are required to park on the road.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S118.003	Maurice Ormsby	Transport	Oppose	Amend the rules to ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be rezoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S120.005	Marion Van Dijk	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S121.005	Catherine Beattie	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S121.010	Catherine Beattie	Transport	Not Stated	[Enable] bus transport.	Not stated.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S122.005	Linda Holloway	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S123.005	Anne Kolless	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S124.005	Brian Strong	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development. I am concerned that the lack of garaging for cars would mean overcrowding of streets in residential areas where roads are already very narrow, e.g. Mount Street, Konini Street.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S124.033	Brian Strong	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S124.034	Brian Strong	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. Eg. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S124.033.	Reject	Key Issue 2

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S124.035	Brian Strong	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S128.005	Avril Peterson	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least 1.5 car parks are provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S135.003	Matthew Schep	Transport	Support	Support the provision to not require new builds to have space for car parking.	Many households in urban centres cannot drive, or do not want to, do not need to, or cannot afford to. Not requiring car parking will allow for a range of options available to future residents of expected projects to meet a range of needs.	Accept	Key Issue 4
S146.005	Murray Dench	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S147.005	Rosemary Weir	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S148.005	Natalya Dempsey	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S149.005	Cheryl Walls	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S150.005	Keryn McKay	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S151.005	Janice Michel	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S152.005	Christine Parai	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S153.005	John Cunningham	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S154.005	Sharon Thomas	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S155.005	Giulia Rogers	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S156.005	Sylvia Meredyth	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S157.005	Belinda-Jane Hart	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S161.005	Chris and Sandra Sutcliffe	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S162.005	Mark Gabites	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.			
S163.005	Pauline Rodgers	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S164.005	Leigh Thompson	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S165.005	Adele Yank	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S166.005	Garth Crosbie	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S167.005	Petra Dunlop	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S169.005	Andrew Dunlop	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S170.005	Owen Dunlop	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S171.005	Graham Pomeroy	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development. Already people are running extension leads across the	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					footpaths at night to charge EVs. This is a major hazard. Each unit has to have parking.		
S172.005	John Sandston	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S173.005	Leigh Davies	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S174.005	David Jack	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S175.005	Alton Street Heritage Precinct	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S176.005	Roger Weeks	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S177.005	Peter McNae	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S178.005	Tony No surname supplied	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S179.005	Raymond Ikink	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S180.005	Geoff Cooper	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S181.005	John Towns	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S182.005	Ellen Stewart	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S183.005	Sandra Hunter	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S184.005	Barbara Amohanga	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S185.005	Stuart Yank	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development. Parking considerations should be paramount.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S186.005	Donna Harris	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development. I am particularly concerned at the lack of parking provisions.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S187.005	Lisa-Maria Perkins	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S188.005	Sue Cunningham	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S189.005	Anton Hyman	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S191.005	Michael Rhoades	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S192.005	Jane Jay	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S200.005	Fiona Perks	Transport	Not Stated	[Request] an amendment to ensure that at least one car is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be rezoned.	Refer to reasons in submission point S200.001.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S202.005	Patricia Morris	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S216.003	Cathie Fearey	Transport	Oppose in part	[Require] dwellings to include [on site] car parking.	Even now, many Nelson roads cannot handle all the cars parked roadside (Bledisloe Ave, parts of Neale Ave). To let developers build without accommodating carparks subsidizes developers.	Reject	Key Issue 4
FS5.004	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	Key Issue 4
FS32.003	Peter Olorenshaw		Oppose	Reject	If you live close to urban centres or transport nodes and prefer not to drive why should you be forced to provide on-site car parking? Our vision is of a city where it is completely normal to visit friends and family by means	Accept	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					other than a car, so even visitors don't need to come by car. Forcing people and businesses to provide more car parking than they actually want or need has been a blight on this city like many others - reinforcing low density development, entrenching car use. People however need to be clear that they can not assume that there will always be car parking on the street outside their house.		
S218.029	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Transport	Oppose in part	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S218.030	Hugh Walton and Louise Trevathan	Transport	Oppose in part	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S218.029.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S222.005	Lesley Kotua	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S226.005	Nigel and Angela Tideman	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S227.005	Sophia Katsoulis	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S228.005	Derek Gray	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S229.005	Hamish Sellers	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.			
S230.005	Steven Judge	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development. Any building will need at least one car park per unit.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S234.001	Vivian Crasta	Transport	Amend	Request an earlier bus [for] Galway street - Nayland Road at 7.07.	Just like me there are a lot of Bus riders who feel they reach late to work or have given up the Bus ride. For instance earlier the bus would leave Louisson Ave Stoke at 6.58 am and would reach Vickerman Street Nelson at 7.10 am, now the Bus leaves Galway street Nayland Road at 7.07 and arrives Vickermanstreet at 7.30.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S239.005	Kyra Wilkie	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S240.005	Peter Wilkie	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S241.005	Amanda Dykzeul	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S242.005	Greg and Amanda Dykzeul	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S246.005	Connie Sellers	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S256.005	Diana Fors	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.			
S261.002	William Freeman	Transport	Oppose	Do not allow on-street parking in Unclassified streets.	The Nelson Residential Street Frontage guidelines (November 2013) provides that "Garages and areas for vehicle maneuvering on or off-site should be carefully located. Reverse manoeuvring onto Unclassified streets is encourage as it assists with calming vehicle speeds. An acceptable means of reducing speed is to permit on street parking to reduce lane widths where adequate sight lines are available". The basic premise of that statement is that cars should primarily be parked off street - and on street parking may assist with calming vehicle speeds but only "...where adequate sight lines are available". Further, the Guidelines state that the rules are aiming to achieve "...a residential street that gives priority to the pedestrian experience as it is safe and pleasant to walk in". Allowing vehicles to park on Unclassified streets (mostly narrow and only 1.5 lanes wide) is dangerous to pedestrians, who have been seen dodging in and out between parked cars to avoid moving vehicles.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S262.005	Sarah Digges La Touche	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S264.005	Dharan Longley	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S266.005	Luke Slotemaker	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S268.005	Richard Palmer	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S270.002	Nicola Horner	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	It would be very naive of any council member to think no family member living in one of these homes, would not own a car. When driving around Stoke I am swerving in and out around the parked cars, giving way to drivers driving the other way. I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S276.005	Jo Murphy	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned. Parking must be provided for any developments.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S287.005	Wendy Ford	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S288.005	Savanna Lovesey	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S289.005	Orlando Lovesey	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S290.002	Richard Watson	Transport	Oppose in part	{Require development to provide carparking].	I am concerned that by not requiring car parks parts of the city will become giant car parks, the streets in some areas are already full in the evenings with many homes having more than one car and although our public transport has improved its very hard to live in Nelson without a car.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S308.003	Michael Potter	Transport	Amend	Amend AP11.7.5.i Micromobility Access as follows: Where vehicle access to a site or residential unit is not provided, pedestrians and micromobility users access **must** ~~needs to~~ be provided. The design of this access should: ...	Medium and high density housing should meet the test of building community resilience including participation for people with disabilities and/or long term health conditions. With an aging population designs for the built environment should enable all residents to visit each other and not be disabled by poor design. Building more accessible homes with a wide range of design features is crucial if housing choice is to become a reality for everyone, including disabled people, in Nelson.	Reject	Key Issue 6
S308.004	Michael Potter	Transport	Support in part	Require Micromobility access to be designated a non smoking area.	Residential access points for disabled people should not be a health hazard or barrier for disabled people and /or people with long term health conditions. As a wheelchair user, lower to the ground, immunity compromised and with less choices for access, I should not have to travel through secondary smoke to enter a residence.	Reject	Key Issue 6
S311.002	Derek Nees	Transport	Not Stated	Return to requiring off-street parking for all vehicles that will be resident in all properties.	Due to the Govt stupid rule change allowing councils to give consent for building's without the need for off-street parking, we are and will continue to see a proliferation of parking of all manner of vehicles on streets which is impeding access for traffic including buses and presenting more opportunity for criminal activity.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S317.005	Rosa Coutts	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S318.005	James Greeks	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S319.005	Pauline Jones	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S324.027	Zero Carbon Nelson Tasman	Transport	Support	Support DO10.1.5 and the proposal for transport mode shift and the removal of minimum carparking.	We are strong proponents of transport mode shift, and applaud your consideration of this in the Plan Change, including removal of minimum parking requirements.	Accept in part	Key Issue 3
FS38.003	Small Time Developments		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Support DO10.1.5 and the proposal for transport mode shift and the removal of minimum carparking. Support moving away from the dominance of cars and providing for those who choose not to have a car.	Accept in part	Key Issue 3
S325.005	Ken Clapcott	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S328.007	Hanni Kaspar	Transport	Amend	Allow for innovative and secure public parking solutions for cars, bikes, scooters etc.	With a multi-activity parking house a couple of the 3 existing open air parking squares could be used for more constructive purposes. Promoting active transport entails offering safe, secure and preferably dry parking of the active transport devices.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S329.024	Inea Yoon	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S329.025	Inea Yoon	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S329.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S334.009	Fiona Hosie	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be HDZ or MDZ.	I oppose the omission of any encouragement to provide carparks in any new development in the area proposed to be zoned HDZ. I oppose the absence of any detailed comment as to the loss of amenity (and future traffic hazard) to the area in	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					the general vicinity of such [a HDZ building] caused by vehicular traffic trying to find a carpark.		
S340.012	John Hugo	Transport	Oppose in part	Allocate resources towards the enhancement of roadways, pedestrian pathways, and public transport services.	The introduction of new developments and increased population density may exert pressure on the existing transportation network. As a result, increased congestion, longer commute times, and a potential strain on public transportation services might occur. It is crucial to allocate resources towards the enhancement of roadways, pedestrian pathways, and public transport services to mitigate these issues. If all the population were riding bicycles and using buses there would still be chaos on the roads at peak times. Why Hill Street in Richmond and Suffolk Road in Nelson are not connected as one baffled me completely. It would surely make sense to have 3 routes between the two areas?	Reject	Key Issue 2
S340.014	John Hugo	Transport	Oppose in part	Connect Hill Street in Richmond and Suffolk Road in Nelson.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S340.012.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S340.019	John Hugo	Transport	Oppose in part	Consider the provision of adequate off-street parking options for various modes of transportation. This includes sufficient spaces for cars, secure bicycle parking, and designated areas for mobility scooters.	Off-Street Parking for Cars, Bicycles, and Mobility Scooters: With the increase in population and housing developments, it is vital to consider the provision of adequate off-street parking options for various modes of transportation. This includes sufficient spaces for cars, secure bicycle parking, and designated areas for mobility scooters. Proper planning for parking infrastructure will contribute to reducing on-street congestion and ensuring accessibility for all residents. In my area if our property and the immediate neighbouring properties are developed with 6(six) storey towers - on 200 sq metres each meaning 87apartments- and assuming 4 persons per apartment, and the four persons each have one bicycle then you have to store 348 bicycles spread across the development somehow.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S343.006	Mark Fielding	Transport	Oppose in part	[Reinstate] required car parking spaces for residential units.	No change to existing required car parking spaces [sic] but with a requirement for 1 extra car park for a new secondary minor dwelling. However such new car spaces (of 15m2 minimum) would not be added to site	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					coverage unless a garage or carport was built on such. Also any carparks not inside buildings, that are already included in site coverage, would be removed from site coverage. Also carparks could be arranged one behind the other, as current.		
S343.007	Mark Fielding	Transport	Support in part	Support retention of AP10.10.ii allowing residential on-site carparks to be arranged one behind the other [inferred].	Refer to reasons in submission point S343.006.	Accept	Key Issue 5
S343.008	Mark Fielding	Transport	Support in part	Support proposed changes to the definition of building coverage to exempt car parking spaces that are not covered by buildings [inferred].	Refer to reasons in submission point S343.006.	Accept	Key Issue 5
S344.024	Marion Satherley	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S344.025	Marion Satherley	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S344.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S345.024	Leonie Allen	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S345.025	Leonie Allen	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S345.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S346.024	Daniel Allen	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					[Refer to the original submission for more detail]		
S346.025	Daniel Allen	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S346.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S347.004	Andrew Herbert & Carol Ward	Transport	Oppose	[Develop a parking] management [plan] so that if house intensification occurs within any plan change process, parking on public roads is not increased.	We are not opposed to intensification per se as a solution to growing housing demand. We do however believe that parking in the residential areas of Nelson is already at capacity and any housing intensification must not shift more parking demand onto the city streets. Street parking already creates safety hazards for at-risk residents, particularly children, the elderly, and those with visual handicaps. These hazards should not be allowed to be increased by any plan change.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S348.024	Rodney Lewis	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S348.025	Rodney Lewis	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. Eg. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S348.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S350.024	Andrew Lush	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S350.025	Andrew Lush	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S350.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S352.007	Derek & Karen Austin	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one carpark must be provided for each residential unit.	We oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in proposed developments. Currently,	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					residential streets near the inner city are used for free parking from Mondays to Fridays.		
S353.024	Rodney Lewis	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S353.025	Rodney Lewis	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. Eg. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point 23	Reject	Key Issue 2
S353.026	Rodney Lewis	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	for road safety reasons Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 1
S354.024	Sally Albrecht	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S354.025	Sally Albrecht	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S354.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S355.005	Bernard Penketh	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development. Cars will be parked out on an already narrow road [and] cause concern with drivers having to drive a one lane avenue when cars are parked on both sides of the road. These proposed homes need garages.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S368.013	Philip McKinlay	Transport	Oppose in part	[Request] Council to provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020, to mitigate against these issues.	Increased intensification will result in more on-street car parking and the narrow streets of Nelson will become a hazard to pedestrians, mobility scooters, and cyclists, refuse collection and Emergency Service vehicles. This will cause fracturing of neighbourly relations and	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					communities.		
S368.027	Philip McKinlay	Transport	Oppose in part	[Request] Council to use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on- street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to the reasons in submission point S368.013.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S379.005	Carole-Ann Lewis	Transport	Oppose in part	[Require] carparking to be provided for each dwelling..	Not stated.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S379.007	Carole-Ann Lewis	Transport	Oppose in part	[Restrict intensification] in Examiner, Wellington and Mount Streets.	New housing should not be at existing rate-payers' expense. Examiner, Wellington and Mount Streets are much too narrow for extra traffic congestion; there is already no parking on nearly all of these streets.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S380.003	Sharon Bryce	Transport	Oppose	Provide carparking in or complementing all future developments.	Further more I understand that Council has no ability to enforce that carparks be included in high rise buildings. To justify and accept this by saying that most developers wouldn't consider leaving carparks out is not responsible planning. Its unacceptable for this door to be left open - The bigger the building ,the more people, the bigger the congestion problem on our streets.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S383.005	Karin Harrison	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S384.024	Arif Matthee	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S384.025	Arif Matthee	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S384.024.	Reject	Key Issue
S386.005	Eric Peter	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.			
S387.005	David Bennett	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S388.024	Gary Calderbank	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S388.025	Gary Calderbank	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S388.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S388.026	Gary Calderbank	Transport	Oppose	Encourage the inclusion of ground floor parking underneath new CBD developments to mitigate some of the impact of intensification.	Refer to reasons in submission point S388.024.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S389.001	Elizabeth Dooley	Transport	Oppose in part	Consider making the city centre free of traffic other than those necessary to restock deliveries. [Require] these deliveries to be made by electric vehicles.	This would give disabled, children, elderly, everyone a chance to relax in a pollution free zone, shopping, dining communicating with each other face to face.	Reject	Key Issue 1
S392.005	Johanna Peter	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S393.005	Paul Fox	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S395.005	Andrew Sullivan	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S396.003	Arnold Ayre	Transport	Amend	Provide for parking to be part of resource consent decisions. This now not required by law, but if resource consent remained on a case by case basis it could be factored into decisions regarding supporting infrastructure.	This is now not required by law, but if resource consent remained on a case by case basis it could be factored into decisions regarding supporting infrastructure. We live in and area where parking is already at a premium and close to a primary school. Safety, and convenience for the current residents need to be considered when large new developments are proposed.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S397.024	Ali Lawley	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S397.025	Ali Lawley	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. Eg. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S397.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S397.026	Ali Lawley	Transport	Oppose	Encourage the inclusion of ground floor parking underneath new CBD developments to mitigate some of the impact of intensification.	Refer to reasons in submission point S397.024.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S402.005	Russell King	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S403.024	Ashley Frechette	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S403.025	Ashley Frechette	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S403.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S405.024	Patricia Carter	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S405.025	Patricia Carter	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S405.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S406.024	Debbie Hampson	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S406.025	Debbie Hampson	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S406.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S409.024	Mary McKinlay	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S409.025	Mary McKinlay	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. Eg. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S409.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S413.002	Scott Figenshow	Transport	Amend	Clarify the meaning of AP11.3A.1 design of micromobility access and how this relates to sleepouts and residential units. In particular:	We offer the "landscape stairway" design at 17 Arrow Street as an example (see consent files BC220488 and BC210747). The existing dwelling at 17 Arrow Street, built in the 1940's already has ramp access to both of its levels; requiring ramp mobility access for the new rear unit is not always going to be possible on the steep hills, and requiring such is a disincentive to intensification. Our	Reject	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				• Clarify whether micromobility means pedestrian access. If so, then modify the standard so the minimum width is reduced to 1m (instead of 1.8m) when the path of travel from the street to the front door is less than 30m and serving only one unit, and that it can be steps and need not offer a step-free option. There should be no requirement for a 1m setback from the building. • Alternaitvely, in relation to 17 Arrow St, upgrade the strip of council land that abuts us to the south to a proper landscaped walkway and allow us and our neighbour to access these newly created residential units from an improved Council walkway.	design provides for several areas of landscaping along the path, as well as two passing bays (otherwise known as landings). Arrow street is a hilly, steep valley; the metaphor should be "walking streets", "walkways", or "pathways".		
S413.008	Scott Figenshow	Transport	Oppose in part	Council to be an activist, coming to landowners with suggestions of what could be done, if Council used its utility reserves and roads more pro-actively to support landowners intensifying.	Refer to the reasons in S413.002.	Reject	Key Issue 1
S417.024	David Smith	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S417.025	David Smith	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S417.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S419.014	John Karolyi	Entire Plan Change	Not Stated	Suggest that you take 1m from all properties front boundaries on the eastern side of Vanguard St	The existing streets are not big enough in width ie Vanguard St to accommodate potentially hundreds, or thousands of extra people, the new buses cannot physically negotiate the roads without crossing centrelines, if the uptakes of buses are successful, one	Reject	Key Issue 1/2

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				from Toi Toi St to Motueka St now.	would assume more buses travelling on roads that they already cannot stay within their own lane on. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]		
S425.010	Tony Stephens	Transport	Support in part	[Rethink] parking and public transport [provisions].	The plan appears to have no provision for parking. In general I support the idea of limited parking in the CBD and possibly even for nearby neighborhoods. However, where practicable, parking decks should be designed in below residential dwellings. Additionally, businesses need to be able to accept deliveries. If transport modes are to limited to that of buses, feet, cycling, or other mobility devices, then footpaths need to be of a sufficient width and design as to accommodate all these modes at once as a shared corridor. Additionally, disable persons, and especially wheelchair bound persons, will need design considerations.	Accept in part	Key Issue 5
S425.011	Tony Stephens	Transport	Support	[Rethink and spell out] good design around other transport modes.	As parking appears to be limited to non-existent in the plan change, good design around other transport modes must be thought through, such as: At dwellings, individuals will not want to carry e-bikes or even less heavy transport modes up stairs or in elevators in six or even three story dwellings. Occupants will appreciate if parking storage keep indoor spaces safe and usable. Criteria for secure, indoor infrastructure, on ground floor levels, should be design requirements. Outdoors, sufficient widths and entry and exit points provided, just as they are currently for vehicles. If buses are to serve these dwellings, the planning needs to go hand in hand with CBD and neighborhood design.	Reject	Key Issue 5

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S436.004	Brent Doherty	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to require] at least one carpark per residential unit in any development.	The [Tahunanui Hill area bordered by Tosswill Road, Tamaki Street and Tahunanui Drive] has steep and undulating narrow roads. To have an expectation that multiple or high rise buildings can be constructed without car parking onsite is fanciful. [Refer to original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S442.027	Vernon Mardon	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S442.028	Vernon Mardon	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S442.027.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S448.012	Anne and Andrew Weir	Transport	Oppose	Require properties in [the Tahunanui and Tosswill Road area] to have off-street parking.	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	Key Issue 4
FS61.047	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.	Reject	Key Issue 4
FS72.051	Jude Osborne		Support	Accept	The Particular Part of the submission I support/:- The Tahunanui commercial area is not a full shopping centre	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					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.		
FS60.043	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.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S450.016	Bernard Brewster	Transport	Oppose	[Develop] a comprehensive car parking management plan, as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020, [to] tackle these issues.	Increased intensification will result in more on-street car parking and the narrow streets of Nelson will increasingly become a hazard to pedestrians, mobility scooters, cyclists, refuse collection and emergency services. This will not help neighbourly relations and communities.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S450.017	Bernard Brewster	Transport	Oppose	[Use] traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces, such as speed humps, instead of choke points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S450.016.	Reject	Key Issue 2

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S451.005	Lewis Thompson	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S452.006	Claire McKenzie	Transport	Support	Support reduced provision of carparking for new developments [inferred].	I am happy to see reduced provision of carparking provided on-sites. The future is not about everyone having private motor vehicles (not even EVs) and especially in the inner city there is less need for this. Walking and cycling corridors and better public transport (such as the recently improved bus service - thank you!) will help to reduce reliance on cars - and intensification makes it more viable to provide these.	Accept	Key Issue 4
S453.024	Stephen Webster	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
FS83.079	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Key Issue 4
FS77.045	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	Key Issue 4
S453.025	Stephen Webster	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S453.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
FS83.080	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Key Issue 2

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
FS77.046	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	Key Issue 2
S453.026	Stephen Webster	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
FS83.081	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Key Issue 1
FS77.047	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	Key Issue 1
S454.004	Jenny Meadows	Transport	Oppose	Require high-rises to have internal parking garages for residents [inferred].	Nelson's current parking situation is abysmal. In tourist season, the situation is even worse. If the high-rises don't have internal parking garages, the residents will be taking up the few spaces allowed for people coming into town to shop, and the residents will be paying a huge premium for their daily parking.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S455.024	Philippa Hoult	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]		
S455.025	Philippa Hoult	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S455.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S455.026	Philippa Hoult	Transport	Oppose	Utilise smaller 6m long buses in as many areas as possible, as opposed to the current 12.5m long buses.	Minimise the amount of car parking that is lost to bus stops, and bus access to those stops. E.g. on Moana Ave, which only has parking on one side of the road, 7 carparks are lost to just 1 bus stop.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S455.045	Philippa Hoult	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be HDZ or MDZ.	Not stated.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S456.005	Stephen Boulton	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S457.024	Laraine Rothenberg	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' to mitigate against these issues.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S457.025	Laraine Rothenberg	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S457.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S457.026	Laraine Rothenberg	Transport	Oppose	[Require] all new buildings to include underground parking for residents.	Refer to reasons in submission point S457.024. It is not appropriate to think that people will not have a car if they can walk to the centre of town. People in towns still need cars to go away on weekends or visit friends in other towns. Thus, parking must be part of any plan with developers asked to include parking spaces in any new construction and pay for necessary infrastructure.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S463.008	Derek Smail and Julia Burbury	Transport	Oppose	Encourage carparks be provided in any new development in the HDZ and MDZ.	[I oppose] the omission of any encouragement that carparks be provided in any new development in the areas proposed to be HDZ or MDZ. If any of [our] neighbours built apartments (with or without providing parking), the existing traffic problems in Examiner Street would be aggravated by cars dropping off/uplifting Nelson College Girls (NCG) students, workers in the CBD parking in the street, Council's decision to have a sinking lid in respect of parking in the CBD and near the CBD.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S464.003	Rosemary Horn	Transport	Support in part	Develop the active transport network and increase public transport services to areas of intensive development [inferred].	Intensification has the opportunity to reduce future peak traffic flows as people could live closer to where they work. Active transport networks would need to be further developed as there could be greater utilisation due to shorter distances to be travelled. Public transport frequencies could be increased to services a higher population benefiting those living close to intensive developments.	Reject in part	Key Issue 2
S464.004	Rosemary Horn	Transport	Amend	[Amend the rules to require] multi-storey [development] to include good and secure bike/scooter storage and charging facilities.	Refer to reasons in S464.003.	Reject in part	Key Issue 5
S467.005	Tasha Workman	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S469.024	Jontaine White	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S469.025	Jontaine White	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g.. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S469.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S469.026	Jontaine White	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S470.024	Amanda White	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S470.025	Amanda White	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S470.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S470.026	Amanda White	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S472.024	Carol Webster	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S472.025	Carol Webster	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S472.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S472.026	Carol Webster	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S474.009	Geoffrey Hayes	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Require on site carparking for new development in Atawhai [inferred].	Atawhai infrastructure cannot support this type of intensification, especially roading. The roads in this part of Atawhai are too narrow to accommodate additional traffic. That includes street-based parking.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					Under PC29 on-site parking will not be necessary, or even permitted. It is not feasible to have resident parking on both sides of the street as that would leave only one lane clear, which is potentially dangerous when vehicles are traveling in both directions. Citizens of Nelson have expressed a preference for houses with offstreet parking (See: The Housing We'd Choose, Reference No. 16a). Atawhai was developed under rules that required garaging or off-street parking. Those rules should remain in place.		
S476.005	Gaile Noonan	Transport	Oppose	Retain and encourage on-site carparking, if the developer wishes to include this.	Removing carparking is unrealistic. Acknowledging this is a Government directive, which may, in the future, be revoked or changed. Need to consider: A potential future Government may change this directive and any local plan change needs to be able to pivot on this item. An aging demographic who require support and care (more lately in-home) which will potentially arrive by vehicle due to equipment needs. People requiring transport of young children, especially large families. Consideration of those participating in activities such as sport and music and transporting large objects for this purpose.	Reject	Key Issue 4
FS83.095	Melinda and Craig Harvey		Support	Accept	Agree with all points in their submission.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S480.024	Yvonne Percy	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S480.025	Yvonne Percy	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S480.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S500.008	Euan Laird	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Oppose PC29] as it does not allow for carping to be incorporated within the intensification building process.	The current PC29 plan does not allow for car parking to be incorporated within the intensification building process. In other words, and particularly in the HDRZ, any or all vehicles associated with the HDRZ in particular, but also the MDRZ and the GRZ. Now while it may be argued that we are moving to a carless society and the 15 minute city concept will be paramount, there will still be a significant number of additional vehicles on the street. In the CBD are they going to have pay car parking meter fees during daylight hours ? Will these vehicles simply add to the clogged car parking facilities that Nelson city currently "enjoys ?" Papakainga dwellings are being cited as the prime exemplars of such dwellings, further exacerbating cultural and societal tensions. I think I have demonstrated that the scope and geography of the PC29 as currently laid out far exceeds that which is necessary, and I call upon NCC to reflect and reconsider, and maybe even apologise for getting it all so wrong.	Reject	Key Issue 4
FS32.013	Peter Olorenshaw		Oppose	Reject	Carparking requirements were misunderstood by some people. The plan change is not proposing stopping people from providing as much onsite carparking as they like. But why should people be forced to provide onsite carparking if they don't want to own a car? If you live close to urban centres or transport nodes and prefer not to drive why should you be forced to provide on-site car parking? Nelsust's vision is of a city where it is completely normal to visit friends and family by means other than a car, so even visitors don't need to come by car. Forcing people and businesses to provide more car parking than they actually want or need has been a blight on this city like many others - reinforcing low density development, entrenching car use. People however need to be clear that they can not assume that there will always be car parking on the street outside their house.	Accept	Key Issue 4
S510.003	Adrian Parlane	Transport	Oppose in part	[Amend the rules] to provide at least one carpark per residential unit.	With no obligation to provide parking there will be a serious increase in demand for street parking. In some areas e.g. northern Bledisloe Avenue there is already	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					congestion issues with residents attempting to alleviate this by parking on the berm, which ironically NCC wanted to ban! Is the strategy to end up selling street parking permits as in Wellington?		
S510.005	Adrian Parlane	Transport	Amend	Request the provision of at least one car park per residential unit. [Refer to the Petition attached to this submission for the 70 signatories in support of this submission].	Not stated.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S512.006	Nelson Tasman Climate Forum	Transport	Amend	Permit EV charging stations in parking spaces in all zones where there is sufficient extra space in the parking stalls.	Not stated.	Reject	Key Issue 5
S512.014	Nelson Tasman Climate Forum	Transport	Support	Support the requirement for cycle parking in new developments.	Nelson is developing excellent biking infrastructure and we want bike culture to thrive. This is critical from a climate change perspective but will reduce the future costs of road widening and road repairs to accommodate increases in traffic. We approve the omission of minimum car-parking requirements.	Accept	Key Issue 5
S515.024	Steven Langford	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail.]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S515.025	Steven Langford	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S515.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S517.012	Megan Courtney	Residential Zones	Oppose	Delete [rule] REr.17D (d).	The NPS-UD has removed mandatory requirements for carparking. Consequently there should be no requirement for an 85 percentile vehicle in the front yard.	Reject	Refer to section 6 of Residential S42A
S524.004	Paul Barter	Transport	Oppose	Adequate parking should be a critical aspect of the plan to ensure the	The plan lacks provisions for additional parking in the medium and high-density residential areas. This oversight could lead to increased parking issues, congestion, and adversely affect the quality of life for	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				accessibility and convenience of these areas.	existing residents. I fully support better walking, biking and public transport access to the inner city but do not believe that people will automatically adopt public transport or change their habits overnight.		
S525.003	Jane Rogers	Transport	Oppose in part	[Create rules that require] carparks to be incorporated within buildings or properties.	I am concerned that there is to be no provision for carparks in these 3 to 6 story dwellings. I understand that they are to be built along bus routes which is great for intra-city travel. But unlike Europe where you can catch trains to different cities, the transport infrastructure in New Zealand is pretty woeful in comparison meaning most people need a car to travel out of their districts. It is hard to believe that people will want homes that have no provision for car parking.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S531.024	David Collier	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S531.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S534.005	Lynette Nicholas	Transport	Oppose in part	Consider provisions for additional parking in the medium and high-density residential areas [inferred].	The plan lacks provisions for additional parking in the medium and high-density residential areas. This oversight could lead to unsafe streets, increased parking issues, congestion, and adversely affect the quality of life for existing residents. Adequate parking should be a critical aspect of the plan to ensure the accessibility and convenience of these areas and safety for us in small narrow streets. I fully support better walking, biking and public transport access to the inner city but do not believe that people will automatically adopt public transport or change their habits overnight and adequate parking provisions are necessary with any increased intensification.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S534.006	Lynette Nicholas	Transport	Support in part	Support better walking, biking and public transport access to the inner city.	Refer to reasons in submission point S534.005.	Accept in part	Key Issue 2
S535.024	Hamish Barker	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S536.028	Leah Collier	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail.]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S536.029	Leah Collier	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S536.028.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S538.004	Alice Hill	Transport	Neutral	[Improve] bike lanes connecting Tahuna to city centre via Rocks Rd.	For road safety reasons.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S540.024	Alexandra Cotton	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	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.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S540.025	Alexandra Cotton	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. Eg. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S540.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S544.023	Andrea Papai	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Parking is already difficult in our community thanks to the narrow streets and the difficult access into driveways. This especially applies to Locking street and the corner where Locking and Wellington Street meet. Sometimes it is hard to drive up Locking St they way it is now! God help any emergency vehicle trying to get up Locking Street if it becomes more congested! Locking St is a resident only street but nobody enforces that and it is still very much used as a rat run. If you are walking up or down the street you are talking your life into your own hands. Cars still speed on Locking even though the bumps have slowed them down a bit. I don't want it to become worse than it already is.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					[Refer to the original submission for more detail.]		
S544.024	Andrea Papai	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S544.023.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S545.004	Jeremy Butler	Transport	Support	Support all transport rules, including destination facilites, cycle parking, maximum parking numbers, etc.	Better support public transport and active transport.	Accept	Key Issue 8
S546.023	Michelle Collier	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S546.024	Michelle Collier	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S546.023.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S560.010	Jane Bayley	Transport	Oppose in part	Require one on site carpark per residential unit within existing residential, general/med/high density zones.	Council has not formulating a parking plan for Nelson. Removing the need for parking will result in chaos on the streets with vehicles blocking the roads preventing emergency vehicle access, particularly on local roads/lanes etc. Except in the Inner City and Fringe require one on site park per residential unit.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S560.014	Jane Bayley	Transport	Oppose	Delete permitted standard AP10.4B end of trip facilities.	The number of showers required within a working premise is a building code matter and should not be included in the NRMP. Delete AP10.4B.	Reject	Key Issue 8
S560.021	Jane Bayley	Transport	Oppose in part	Enable structures within road reserve to enable off street parking.	Refer to reasons in submission point S560.010.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S563.004	Meagan O'Brien	Transport	Oppose	Requiring [on site] car-parking for residents and their guests [inferred].	Car parking is already very difficult where I live... I have music students who have to carry their instruments to my house for their lessons. They park on the street because my driveway is not an easy one to navigate... allowing for multi-storey buildings without requiring car-parking for	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					residents AND THEIR GUESTS will be disastrous in this area, and may mean that people have to walk very far to visit us or have their lessons. This will create more isolation and economic disadvantage... [Refer to the original submission for more detail]		
S565.004	James McPhie	Transport	Oppose in part	Consider provision for improved car parking and traffic movement on streets that have issues with traffic and parking [inferred].	Certain areas do not lend itself, even to mid density. Locking Street, for example, currently has issue with regards to traffic and parking. To intensify without any provision, which is now deemed acceptable, would cause would increased traffic congestion issues.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S570.001	Disability Connect	Transport	Amend	Change [Appendix 11.7.5.i - Micromobility Access] "mobility users access needs to be provided" to mobility users access needs "must" be provided.	Designs for the built environment in all residential areas should enable all residents to visit each and not be disabled by poor design. Building more accessible housing with a wide range of design features is crucial for a population that is aging and has increased mobility challenges to have choices in housing.	Reject	Key Issue 6
FS56.075	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Whilst Kāinga Ora supports the provision of an accessible environment, this directive requirement is too restrictive.	Accept	Key Issue 6
S570.002	Disability Connect	Transport	Support in part	Consider changes to ensure that at least a percentage of both Medium Density and High Density developments meet Lifemark Level 4 accessibility standards orhigher. This could be done through a designated percentage of a development dedicated to accessible housing, stipulations that all lower floor apartments and single storey housing can only be consented by Council if designs for these comply with universal design standards using prescribed design guides as a minimum starting point or through incentives.	We are concerned that the requirements for 'micro-mobility' on sites that do not have vehicle access to a site, including step free options (D1/D2) as specified in NZS 4121 design for access and mobility) do not go far enough to meet the needs of an aging population including increased physical and sensory disabilities. Under the Building Act 2004, Medium Density currently does not require lift access for 3 level dwellings unless 50 people or more reside on the 3rd floor of multi-unit site. We would like to see Council put aside funding to incentivise developers who utilise Universal Design Standards to Level 4 or higher, as is already the case in Wellington. The burden of not using Universal Design is particularly acute in Social Housing, Public Housing and rented accommodation where tenure is not guaranteed, choices	Reject	Key Issue 5

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					are scarce and government/social housing providers face increased costs to do modifications. Incentivising Universal Design will have long term benefits for Nelson, with reduced burden on health services and increased well-being of residents contributing to a thriving and resilient community. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]		
FS56.076	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Whilst Kāinga Ora supports the provision of an accessible environment, such directive requirements for every development are too restrictive, and furthermore the relief sought would require approval from a third party and is thus ultra vires.	Accept	Key Issue 6
S573.001	David Allan	Transport	Support	[Enable] single lane private ways to serve up to 20 residential units to support the residential intensification objective.	Single lane private ways are a common feature of existing residential areas of Nelson. Many are serving sites (properties) with a single residential unit on a large land area. In many cases it is not feasible to create a two way private way (or residential lane) due to topography. This is the case with our single lane private way (shared ROW). We have shared a single lane private way for over 25 years with the first part from the road shared by all 10 properties. 7 properties share at least 70m of shared single lane private way before branching into two further private ways. In the 25 years I can only recall encountering another vehicle a handful of times requiring one of us to reverse or duck into a driveway. I am suggesting the number of residential units is specified at up to 20 that can be served by an existing single lane private way. This will facilitate the intent for intensification of 'brown field' areas in all of the residential zones by enabling at least 3 residential units per site (property). This aligns with Council intent to reduce parking requirements reflecting the desired move in transport away from privately owned cars to other modes and the massive increase in use of e-bikes.	Accept in part	Key Issue 6

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S576.024	Dominic Alford	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S576.025	Dominic Alford	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S576.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S577.024	Adrienne Alford	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S577.025	Adrienne Alford	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S577.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S578.004	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Transport	Support in part	[Intensification] needs to be considered in conjunction with (not in isolation to) Nelson's transport issues (i.e. traffic congestion) and any plans to build new vehicle transport roads into/out of/through Nelson.	Not stated.	Accept in part	Key Issue 2
S578.015	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Transport	Support	Support not requiring dwellings to have a space [on site] for cars to park.	I support not requiring dwellings to have a space for cars to park (this seems to be working in Wellington) but improving accessibility for other modes of transport (close streets to cars, make paths wider, buses/trams/other public transport through centre of town). The new EBus service is a great start! Maybe, one central, multi-storey parking lot in or near the CBD would be helpful.	Accept	Key Issue 4
S578.016	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Transport	Support in part	Improve accessibility for other modes of transport (close streets to cars, make paths wider, buses/trams/other public transport through centre of town).	Refer to reasons in submission point S578.015.	Accept in part	Key Issue 2

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S578.017	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Inner City and City Fringe Zones	Amend	[Encourage/ provide] one central, multi-storey parking lot in or near the CBD.	Refer to reasons in submission point S578.015.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S578.018	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Transport	Amend	Keep rental e-scooters (like Lime & Uber) out of Nelson.	I think it's vital we keep rental e-scooters (like Lime & Uber)out of Nelson. These companies basically take up valuable pavement real estate without paying anything for it. They are also pose huge safety issues and become a parasite on the city when left sitting all over the place. That said, I would potentially support e-bike rentals with proper planning and stations to park and recharge them.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S578.019	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Transport	Amend	Support e-bike rentals with proper planning and stations to park and recharge them.	Refer to reasons in submission point S578.018.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S578.021	Benjamin Plows-Kolff	Transport	Amend	Support access to CBD via public transport and active transport.	Refer to reasons in submission point S578.003.	Accept in part	Key Issue 1
S579.005	Dee Taylor	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S580.007	Small Time Developments	Transport	Support	Support acknowledging micromobility as a transport mode.	Not stated. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Key Issue 1
S580.018	Small Time Developments	Transport	Support	Support the inclusion of definitions for cycleparking and micromobility.	Definitions for cycleparking and micromobility recognise transport modes other than cars and reflect the move from central government to remove car parking requirements.	Accept	Key Issue 10
S580.023	Small Time Developments	Transport	Support in part	Support amendment of DO10.1.5 access to sites to include pedestrian and micromobility users in addition to vehicles.	The addition of pedestrian and micromobility provisions are supported as an alternative to only vehicle access and encourage a transport mode shift, in objectives and policies.	Accept in part	Key Issue 3
S580.024	Small Time Developments	Transport	Support in part	Support amendment of DO10.1.7 pedestrian and bicycle traffic to include	Refer to reasons in submission point S580.023.	Accept	Key Issue 3

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				pedestrian and micromobility users.			
S580.025	Small Time Developments	Transport	Support in part	Support DO14.3.1 Roading to include the addition of pedestrian and micromobility provisions as an alternative to only vehicle access.	Refer to reasons in submission point S580.023.	Accept	Key Issue 3
S583.005	Janet Matheson	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development	Reject	Key Issue 4
S584.002	Noeline Vincent	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Suggests] the car sale lots on Rutherford Street be offered an area further out of the inner city land they now occupy [to allow more sites for development instead of developing existing residential sites, and reduce on street carparking].	Our street, Brougham Street, between Trafalgar Street and Rutherford Street frequently has very few car parks available during the bulk of the year, with the NCG student cars and all day parkers often leaving no parking spaces available for families to visit Fairfield Parks. With no 'off street parking requirement' for Blocks of Apartments, this may well become a regular occurrence -- blocking access for emergency vehicles when needed. [Refer to Page 2 in the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 2
S587.008	Change PC 29 Incorporated	Transport	Oppose	Oppose the omission of any encouragement to provide carparks in any new development in the area proposed to be zoned High Density Residential Zone.	The loss of amenity (and future traffic hazard) to the area in the general vicinity of such a building: caused by vehicular traffic trying to find carparks.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S589.002	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Transport	Support in part	Amend APP11.3A as follows: AP11.3A design of micromobility access: ... i. **have a 3m width clear of obstructions and a centred** 1.8m minimum sealed width; and~~p. where the micromobility access adjoins a building, a minimum 1m~~	Fire and Emergency support the inclusion of the following within the design standard for micromobility access: • The provision of passing bays for accessways that exceed 50m in length. • Management of the maximum gradient permitted. • Requirement for accessways to be illuminated during hours of darkness and incorporate CPTED principles. • Requirement for surface treatments which are firm, stable and slip resistant in any weather condition.	Reject	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				~~setback from the building shall be provided for landscaping to provide physical buffer between themicromobility access and buildings for opening windows and to contribute to privacy and amenity. The landscape setback shall be free of any buildings, servicing facilities (including waste bins), parking or manoeuvring areas.~~**p. Landscaping either side of the 1.8m formed accessway should not exceed 1.5m in height and must be trimmed to maintain the clear 1.8m pathway at all times.**	It is vital that where developments are only provided with micromobility access, the effective and efficient access and manoeuvring of crew and equipment for firefighting, medical, rescue and other emergency response is considered. Fire and Emergency would prefer a 4m width, however it recognises the practical realities of providing this. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]		
FS56.086	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kainga Ora opposes the proposed change as this does not provide sufficient clarity on how the rule would be applied, and the amendment to significantly increase access width could act to preclude development on some sites. It is the view of Kāinga Ora that the notified provision is sufficient, noting that the rule as drafted requires passing bays. Access to fire hydrants and length of driveways and pedestrian accesses would be better matters to consider so that fire hoses are able to reach properties.	Accept	Key Issue 6
FS68.001	Retirement Villages		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amending APP11.3A design of micromobility access as	Accept	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
	Association of New Zealand Inc.				follows: ... i. have a 3m width clear of obstructions and a centred 1.8m minimum sealed width; and Replacing 11.3A.p. with: "p. Landscaping either side of the 1.8m formed accessway should not exceed 1.5m in height and must be trimmed to maintain the clear 1.8m pathway at all times. " 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.		
FS69.001	Ryman Healthcare Limited		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amending APP11.3A design of micromobility access as follows: i. have a 3m width clear of obstructions and a centred 1.8m minimum sealed width; and Replacing 11.3A.p. with: "p. Landscaping either side of the 1.8m formed accessway should not exceed 1.5m in height and must be trimmed to maintain the clear 1.8m pathway at all times. " 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.	Accept	Key Issue 6
S589.003	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Transport	Support in part	Amend APP11.7.5 as follows: AP11.7.5 Micromobility access Where vehicle access to a site or residential unit is not provided, pedestrians and micromobility users access needs to be provided. The design of this access should: • Provide for people of all abilities • Incorporate CPTED design principals to ensure the safety of all users	Fire and Emergency support AP11.7.5 insofar as it requires development to achieve suitable access for residential units from the street where vehicle access is not provided. However, Fire and Emergency consider it important that emergency service access it sufficiently considered where developments are only accessible to pedestrians.	Reject	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				• Enable wayfinding and dwelling identification • Provide for privacy and amenity. • **Enable emergency services to access the site in an emergency.**			
S589.004	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Transport	Oppose	In App11.3 amend the minimum formation width for private accessways / crossings to 4m. Or alternatively, apply a maximum accessway length for undersized accessways/crossings and where there is an exceedance, require a 4m formation width or the provision of a suitable hardstand.	Fire and Emergency support the inclusion of a matter of discretion which enables NCC to consider whether the design provides for the operational requirements of fire appliances. It is important however that the design and construction standards of the Nelson Tasman Land Development Manual 2020 align with the requirements of Designers' guide to firefighting operations Emergency vehicle access F5-02 GD which are required to facilitate efficient and effective emergency service vehicle access. This will ensure that the objectives and policies relating to safe and efficient access to sites are provided for through the rule framework that requires appropriate design of vehicle accesses and crossings. Fire and Emergency note that Table 4-13 of the Nelson Tasman Land Development Manual 2020 sets out the minimum requirements for accesses with a minimum carriageway width of 2.75m permitted within the Residential Zone. By way of background, for fire appliances to access an emergency, adequate accessway width, height and gradient is necessary. A 95th percentile pumping appliance has a width of 2.5m, a height of 3.55m and a length of 8.72m. Vehicular roading and access widths, surface and gradients should support the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency appliances. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 6

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
FS68.002	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: In APP11.3 amend the minimum formation width for private accessways / crossings to 4m. Or alternatively, apply a maximum accessway length for undersized accessways/crossings and where there is an exceedance, require a 4m formation width or the provision of a suitable hardstand. 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.	Accept	Key Issue 6
FS69.002	Ryman Healthcare Limited		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: In APP11.3 amend the minimum formation width for private accessways / crossings to 4m. Or alternatively, apply a maximum accessway length for undersized accessways/crossings and where there is an exceedance, require a 4m formation width or the provision of a suitable hardstand. 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.	Accept	Key Issue 6
S589.005	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Industrial Zone	Oppose	Amend INr.73.2 to ensure that all new allotments managed by this rule are provided with: • a firefighting water supply (and access to that supply) in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice. • provides appropriately designed access for emergency service vehicles so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently.	Fire and Emergency consider the matters of control associated with INr.73.2 do not provide NCC with the scope to consider whether the subdivision design has appropriately considered emergency service access and firefighting water supply.	Reject	Key Issue 6

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S589.006	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Industrial Zone	Support in part	Amend as follows: INr.73.4 Assessment criteria**x. whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice.x. whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently.**	Fire and Emergency support the consideration of the servicing of sites within the assessment criteria. However, it is important that the provision of emergency service access and firefighting water supplies is considered consistently across all zones within Nelson city. As such, Fire and Emergency seek an amendment to reflect this.	Reject	Key Issue 6
S589.007	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Suburban Commercial Zone	Neutral	Amend SCr.20A.1 as follows: SCr.20A.1 A residential activity is a permitted activity provided that: a. it is located above the ground floor of any building; and b. habitable buildings used for the activity must be connected to a community water supply **(sufficient to also provide for firefighting purposes)** and the wastewater network; and c. stormwater from the site used for the activity must not drain to any public road, except for secondary flow purposes.*d. the*	Fire and Emergency note that while a connection to a water supply may be able to be achieved for activities falling under this rule, this does not necessarily mean that there is capacity available within the network and that this also provides for firefighting purposes. Capacity availability of the water supply should therefore be required as a permitted activity standard, along with emergency service access.	Reject	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				building can be accessed by emergency service vehicles.			
FS68.010	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend SCr.20A.1 as follows: A residential activity is a permitted activity provided that: a. it is located above the ground floor of any building; and b. habitable buildings used for the activity must be connected to a community water supply (sufficient to also provide for firefighting purposes) and the wastewater network; and c. stormwater from the site used for the activity must not drain to any public road, except for secondary flow purposes. d. the building can be accessed by emergency service vehicles. 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.	Accept	Key Issue 6
FS69.003	Ryman Healthcare Limited		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend SCr.20A.1 as follows: A residential activity is a permitted activity provided that: a. it is located above the ground floor of any building; and b. habitable buildings used for the activity must be connected to a community water supply (sufficient to also provide for firefighting purposes) and the wastewater network; and c. stormwater from the site used for the activity must not drain to any public road, except for secondary flow purposes. d. the building can be accessed by emergency service vehicles. Ryman opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the	Accept	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change.		
S589.008	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Residential Zones	Amend	Amend REr.63.4 as follows: REr.63.4 Assessment criteria ...*f. whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice.g. whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently.*	It is important that the provision of emergency service access and firefighting water supplies is considered consistently across all zones within Nelson city. As such, Fire and Emergency seek an amendment to reflect this.	Reject	Key Issue 6
FS68.011	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend REr.63.4 Assessment criteria: ...f. whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice. g. whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently. 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.	Accept	Key Issue 6
FS69.004	Ryman Healthcare Limited		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: REr.63.4 Assessment criteria ...f. whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice.	Accept	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					g. whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently. 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.		
S589.009	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Suburban Commercial Zone	Oppose	Amend SCr.71.2 to ensure that all new allotments managed by this rule are provided with: • a firefighting water supply (and access to that supply) in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice. • provides appropriately designed access for emergency service vehicles so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently.	Fire and Emergency consider the matters of control associated with SCr.71.2 do not provide NCC with the scope to consider whether the subdivision design has appropriately considered emergency service access and firefighting water supply.	Reject	Key Issue 6
FS68.012	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend SCr.71.2 to ensure that all new allotments managed by this rule are provided with: - firefighting water supply (and access to that supply) in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice. - provides appropriately designed access for emergency service vehicles so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently. 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.	Accept	Key Issue 6
FS69.005	Ryman Healthcare Limited		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend SCr.71.2 to ensure that all new allotments managed by this rule are provided with:	Accept	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					- firefighting water supply (and access to that supply) in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice. - provides appropriately designed access for emergency service vehicles so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently. 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.		
S589.010	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Suburban Commercial Zone	Support in part	Amend SCr.71.4 as follows: SCr.71.4 Assessment criteria*x. whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice.x. whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently.*	Fire and Emergency support the consideration of the servicing of sites within the assessment criteria. However, it is important that the provision of emergency service access and firefighting water supplies is considered consistently across all zones within Nelson city. As such, Fire and Emergency seek an amendment to reflect this.	Reject	Key Issue 6
FS68.013	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend SCr.71.4 as follows: SCr.71.4 Assessment criteria x. whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice. x. whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently. The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-	Accept	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change.		
FS69.006	Ryman Healthcare Limited		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend SCr.71.4 as follows: SCr.71.4 Assessment criteria x. whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice. x. whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently. 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.	Accept	Key Issue 6
S589.011	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Inner City and City Fringe Zones	Oppose	Amend ICr.37D.1 as follows: ICr.37D.1 A residential activity is a permitted activity provided that: a. it is located above the ground floor of any building; and b. habitable buildings used for the activity must be connected to a community water supply *(sufficient to also provide for firefighting purposes)* and the wastewater network; and c. stormwater from the site used for the activity must not drain to any public road, except for secondary flow purposes.*d. the building can be accessed by emergency service vehicles.*	Fire and Emergency note that while a connection to a water supply may be able to be achieved for activities falling under this rule, this does not necessarily mean that there is capacity available within the network and that this also provides for firefighting purposes. Capacity availability of the water supply should therefore be required as a permitted activity standard, along with emergency service access.	Reject	Key Issue 6

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S589.012	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Inner City and City Fringe Zones	Support in part	Amend ICr.37D.4 as follows: ICr.37D.4 Assessment criteria ...*f. whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice.g. whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently.*	It is important that the provision of emergency service access and firefighting water supply is considered consistently across all zones within Nelson city and across all activity types, including permitted activities. As such, Fire and Emergency seek an amendment to reflect this.	Reject	Key Issue 6
FS68.003	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend ICr.37D.4 as follows: ICr.37D.4 Assessment criteria ...f. whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice. g. whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently. 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.	Accept	Key Issue 6
FS69.007	Ryman Healthcare Limited		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend ICr.37D.4 as follows: ICr.37D.4 Assessment criteria ...f. whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of	Accept	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					Practice. g. whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently. 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.		
S589.013	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Inner City and City Fringe Zones	Oppose	Amend ICr.81.2 to ensure that all new allotments managed by this rule are provided with: • a firefighting water supply (and access to that supply) in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice. • provides appropriately designed access for emergency service vehicles so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently.	Fire and Emergency consider the matters of control associated with ICr.81.2 do not provide NCC with the scope to consider whether the subdivision design has appropriately considered emergency service access and firefighting water supply.	Reject	Key Issue 6
S589.014	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Inner City and City Fringe Zones	Support in part	Amend ICr.81.4 as follows: ICr.81.4 Assessment criteria ...***x.*** *whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice.x. whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently.*	Fire and Emergency support the consideration of the servicing of sites within the assessment criteria. However, it is important that the provision of emergency service access and firefighting water supplies is considered consistently across all zones within Nelson city. As such, Fire and Emergency seek an amendment to reflect this.	Reject	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
FS68.004	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend ICr.81.4 as follows: ICr.81.4 Assessment criteria ...x. whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice. x. whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently. 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.	Accept	Key Issue 6
FS69.008	Ryman Healthcare Limited		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend ICr.81.4 as follows: ICr.81.4 Assessment criteria ...x. whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice. x. whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently. 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.	Accept	Key Issue 6
S589.016	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Residential Zones	Oppose	Amend REr.63.1 as follows: Erection or extension of buildings in the Services Overlay is permitted if it is located in the General Residential Zone, Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone, ~~or~~ **and**: a) it is not located in the path of any future road.....	AD11.3.3 of the NRMP acknowledges that the Services Overlay identifies areas which contain servicing constraints for new development in relation to both three waters and roading. REr.63.1 currently provides for the erection of new buildings in the Services Overlay and within one of the listed Residential Zones. This does not however require applicants to demonstrate that new buildings can be appropriately provided with emergency service access and firefighting water supply. Fire and	Reject	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				b) Existing Council water *(including firefighting water supply)*, stormwater and wastewater connections are available to the site and have capacity to serve the building and associated development, and c) ....*d) emergency service access to the building can be achieved.*	Emergency are therefore opposed to these provisions in the absence of any requirement to demonstrate that appropriate access and servicing can be achieved.		
S589.017	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Suburban Commercial Zone	Support in part	Amend SCr.20A.4 as follows [in bold]:*f. whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice.* *g. whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently.*	It is important that the provision of emergency service access and firefighting water supplies is considered consistently across all zones within Nelson city. As such, Fire and Emergency seek an amendment to reflect this.	Reject	Key Issue 6
FS68.006	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Inc.		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend SCr.20A.4 as follows: f. whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice. g. whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently. The RVA opposes this relief as matters relating to fire-	Accept	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls in this plan change.		
FS69.010	Ryman Healthcare Limited		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Amend SCr.20A.4 as follows: f. whether the development can be adequately serviced for firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Water Supplies Code of Practice. g. whether access for emergency service vehicles is appropriately designed so that staff can access the site safely and efficiently. 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.	Accept	Key Issue 6
S589.022	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Transport	Support in part	Amend as follows [in bold]: DO10.1.5 access to sites Every site should have an access that provides safe *and efficient* entry and exit for pedestrians, micromobility users **and/**or vehicles from the site to a road, without compromising the safety or efficiency of the road network, the safety of different types of road users or the streetscape values.	Fire and Emergency support DO10.1.5 to the extent that the objective recognises the need to provide safe access to every site without compromising the safety or efficiency of the road network. It is important every site has sufficient access for emergency services, as discussed in Section 1.3 above. Fire and Emergency consider that the outcome of DO10.1.5 is unclear and greater focus should be given to the efficiency of access within sites, whether that be pedestrian only access or vehicle access.	Accept	Key Issue 63
S589.026	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Subdivision	Support	Retain DO14.3.1 Roading, as drafted.	Fire and Emergency support DO14.3.1 on the basis that the objective includes specific consideration of the effects of development / subdivision on the safe and efficient operation of the road network, which is	Accept	Key Issue 3

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					beneficial for the movement of emergency service vehicles around the district.		
S591.007	Kent Inglis	Transport	Oppose in part	[Consider] exemptions from Appendix 11 and NTLDM 4.10.2.1 Private access rules allowing an access way to only serve up to 6 residential units or dwellings.	This rule gives no consideration to potential vehicle use (ie less use in near city locations and on public transport routes), nor to potential vehicles on site (ie 6 x 2 bedroom dwellings may have one car space and a maximum of 6 vehicles on site, where as 6 x 3 bedroom dwellings may have 2 carparks on site so twice the vehicles and potentially twice the vehicle movements).	Reject	Key Issue 6
S596.009	Jennifer-Anne Fletcher	Transport	Oppose	[Require] new buildings including all apartment buildings, provide parking, including for cars for one park per apartment or other dwelling type.	Restrictions on the use of motor vehicles, through traffic and parking will put pressure on surrounding residential areas. Any new buildings should have to provide car parking as the pressure on parking particularly for inner city residents is already considerable. If the council wants people to live in the inner city and for it to be safe then there needs to be adequate parking and residential parking. For the foreseeable future cars and other larger motorised vehicles are likely to continue to be used. Apartment buildings particularly need to provide parking on site as they bring increased population pressure into an area. Adequate parking brings safety to an area and its residents and those using it. If viable options of public transport are provided that will in itself offset use of private vehicles.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S596.010	Jennifer-Anne Fletcher	Transport	Oppose	Retain good through access and parking in the city for all vehicles types.	Reduction of through traffic in the inner-city fringe and centre areas to larger motor vehicles such as cars will cause less through traffic and ability access the inner city and is not workable for business or people using the inner city. Refer to reasons in submission point S613.008.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S597.014	Stephanie Phillips	Transport	Amend	Require each site to provide one parking space per dwelling.	Vehicles - Each site to provide one parking space / dwelling. On site vehicle parking places vehicle responsibility at hand of developer and not reliant on street parking to enable cycle lanes on street instead of vehicle storage.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S598.004	David Rees	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Request that] any intensification provide for [sufficient] access roads, parking, [and space] for the placing of multiple waste and recycling bins.	I have seen developments in Europe where the density of dwellings increases, access roads become narrow and insufficient allowance is made for parking or the placing of multiple waste and recycling bins. Any intensification should allow for this.	Reject	Key Issue 2/4
S601.003	Julie Strange	Transport	Oppose	Do something about hospital parking.	There are no services for people who live in the zone adjacent to the hospital. The hospital is already a congested area. They need to do something about hospital parking. People who work at hospitals DO NOT WANT to live this close to their work, (I'm a hospital worker I know). It is already dangerous at times about Nelson hospital with Franklin village and its residents spilling out on the streets. The A and E is a busy place it doesn't need more congestion in this area.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S602.006	Andrew Ng	Transport	Amend	Require on site car parking to be provided [inferred].	More tall buildings mean more cars. The plan doesn't talk about parking, which is a problem. People in Nelson use cars a lot and it will take decades to change behaviours. Without enough parking, streets will be full and it could be dangerous, making public transport even less appealing.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S603.015	SPArchitect Ltd	Transport	Amend	Require each site to provide one parking space per dwelling.	Vehicles - Each site to provide one parking space / dwelling. On site vehicle parking places vehicle responsibility at hand of developer and not reliant on street parking to enable cycle lanes on street instead of vehicle storage.	Reject	Key Issue 4
FS56.087	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought. Policy 11 of the NPS-UD directs tier 1, 2 and 3 territorial authorities not to set minimum car parking requirements, other than accessible parking.	Accept	Key Issue 4
FS38.018	Small Time Developments		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Require each site to provide one parking space per dwelling. This goes against national guidelines and some developments should be allowed to cater for those who choose not to have a car and use other modes of transport. Support moving away from the dominance of	Accept	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					cars and providing for those who choose not to have a car. Not every existing residential site in Nelson can physically have vehicle access.		
S606.017	David Ayre	Transport	Support in part	Provide good facilities for the use of e-bike and EV recharging 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 e-bike and EV recharging.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S606.018	David Ayre	Transport	Amend	Plan to gradually extend the Ebus service to cover other areas of the city as needed.	Nelson has an excellent eBus service. This needs to be gradually extended to cover other areas of the city as needed. One key part of this is that routes need to be identified as stable and committed, so that urban design changes can work on the basis that good public transport will be available in those locations in much the same form well into the future. Good public transport is a form of infrastructure, and many other things in the city need to be able to plan around it.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S607.008	Belinda Fletcher	Transport	Oppose	[Require] new buildings including all apartment buildings, provide parking, including for cars for one park per apartment or other dwelling type.	Restrictions on the use of motor vehicles, through traffic and parking will put pressure on surrounding residential areas. Any new buildings should have to provide car parking as the pressure on parking particularly for inner city residents is already considerable. If the council wants people to live in the inner city and for it to be safe then there needs to be adequate parking and residential parking. For the foreseeable future cars and other larger motorised vehicles are likely to continue to be used. Apartment buildings particularly need to provide parking on site as they bring increased population pressure into an area. Adequate parking brings safety to an area and its residents and those using it. If viable options of public transport are provided that will in itself offset use of private vehicles.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S607.009	Belinda Fletcher	Transport	Oppose	Retain good through access and parking in the city for all vehicles types.	Reduction of through traffic in the inner-city fringe and centre areas to larger motor vehicles such as cars will cause less through traffic and ability access the inner city and is not workable for business or people using the inner city. Refer to reasons in submission point S613.008.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S608.015	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Transport	Amend	Change the Land Development Manual to be included to allow much narrower cycle paths to be included alongside but clearly distinct from cycle paths up on existing footpaths in all residential areas. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Currently we assume we need very wide cycle lanes and very wide walking paths and so these can rarely be accommodated within existing footpaths, we think this is wrong. Overseas experience shows us how much narrower paths can be completely usable as long as they alongside each other: With the foot and cycle paths being adjacent a person on a bike can temporarily use the walking path to overtake another person on a bike, provided the way is clear, likewise with people walking, they can walk around people stopped to chat by using the cycle path if that is clear. Other things not readily apparent in this photo that we ask NCC to emulate is that the grass (and trees) are on the street side meaning the transition from street level to cycle/footpath level is taken up by grass areas, not on walking or cycle paths. It also means that a passenger side parked car door opening is not going to present a hazard to someone biking past. The services here are under the pavers that can be taken up to change services and invisibly put back once changes to services are made. Likewise these pavers can be revelled if they ever come out of level. Lastly the paving treatment is consistent thoughout the town - if you are on the pavers - you aren't on a cycle path. Although pavers like this are not cheap they are very long lasting without maintenance. They don't look tacky or rapidly become indistinct or tired looking like painted demarcations do. And with services changes not resulting in a patchwork quilt of asphalt repairs, the paths maintain a high quality in both appearance and function.To be clear we do not support shared paths on commuter routes, but these are not shared paths - they are clearly demarcated cycle and walking paths and virtually every footpath in the city could have them.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S608.016	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Transport	Support	Support [AP10.5A electric vehicle supply equipment] and recommendation 8.3 of Appendix 3F of S32 Report: new rule where on site car parks are provided, each residential unit should have access to at least one car park that has either a	Proximity as a transport solution is critical in this climate emergency. 93% of our emissions at a household level are from transport. Everything else we do at a household level to mitigate against climate change is just noise compared to transport. And Statistics NZ say that this region's emissions are the worst in the country,	Accept	Key Issue 5

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				charger or the infrastructure such as ducting and switchboard capacity to support charging equipment.	double what Marlborough's are. These measures (and other suggested in our submission) will help reduce our transport emissions, will help make the 40%+ reduction in vehicle km travelled essential to our climate change commitments.		
S608.020	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Transport	Amend	Change the Land Development Manual to require a planted berm between the road carriage way and footpaths or cycle paths in all residential areas [inferred].	We ask NCC to emulate [the example photo from Munich included in the original submission]. The grass (and trees) are on the street side meaning the transition from street level to cycle/footpath level is taken up by grass areas, not on walking or cycle paths. It also means that a passenger side parked car door opening is not going to present a hazard to someone biking past. The services here are under the pavers that can be taken up to change services and invisibly put back once changes to services are made. Likewise these pavers can be revelled if they ever come out of level.	Reject	Key Issue 1
S608.021	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Transport	Amend	Change the Land Development Manual to require all pedestrian only footpaths to be changed to pavers [inferred].	We ask NCC to emulate [the example photo from Munich included in the original submission]. The the paving treatment is consistent thoughout the town - if you are on the pavers - you aren't on a cycle path. Although pavers like this are not cheap they are very long lasting without maintenance. They don't look tacky or rapidly become indistinct or tired looking like painted demarcations do. And with services changes not resulting in a patchwork quilt of asphalt repairs, the paths maintain a high quality in both appearance and function. To be clear we do not support shared paths on commuter routes, but these are not shared paths - they are clearly demarcated cycle and walking paths and virtually every footpath in the city could have them.	Reject	Key Issue 1
S608.022	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Transport	Support	Support Good Cycle Network connections to be included in new subdivision plans, including protected cycle paths where the speed limit may be or become faster than 30kph.	Good Cycle Network connections should need to be shown in new subdivision plans, including protected cycle paths where the speed limit may be or become faster than 30kph.	Accept	Key Issue 1

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S608.023	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Transport	Support	Support recommendation 9.3 of the Appendix 3F of S32 Report: Cycle Parking. Require mandatory provision of cycle parking on site using a table that prescribes minimum numbers of cycle parking based on the type and size of activities. Include residential and non residential activities. The recommended numbers should align with other district plan requirements. Cycle parking should not be required for residential units that have a dedicated garage or covered carpark.	Not stated.	Accept	Key Issue 5
S608.024	Nelsust Inc. - Peter Olorenshaw	Transport	Support	Support the changes to ICr.31.3 to specify maximum not minimum car parking numbers.	Refer to reasons in submission point S608.001.	Accept	Key Issue 4
S610.008	Sarah Little	Transport	Support	[Support] accessible car parking for accessible dwellings, mandating bike parking, and acoustic insulation near highways.	These are sensible.	Accept	Key Issue 5
S613.008	Jason McCormick	Transport	Oppose	[Require] new buildings including all apartment buildings, provide parking, including for cars for one park per apartment or other dwelling type.	Restrictions on the use of motor vehicles, through traffic and parking will put pressure on surrounding residential areas. Any new buildings should have to provide car parking as the pressure on parking particularly for inner city residents is already considerable. If the council wants people to live in the inner city and for it to be safe then there needs to be adequate parking and residential parking. For the foreseeable future cars and other larger motorised vehicles are likely to continue to be used. Apartment buildings particularly need to provide parking on site as they bring increased population pressure into an area. Adequate parking brings safety to an area and its residents and those using it. If viable options of public transport are provided that will in itself offset use of private vehicles.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S613.009	Jason McCormick	Transport	Oppose	Retain good through access and parking in the city for all vehicles types.	Reduction of through traffic in the inner-city fringe and centre areas to larger motor vehicles such as cars will cause less through traffic and ability access the inner city and is not workable for business or people using the inner city. Refer to reasons in submission point S613.008.	Reject	Key issue 4
S620.006	Roger Sowman	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S621.004	Paula Holden	Transport	Support in part	[Support] Transport reasons for densification.	Allowing some densification in the inner city & fringe in particular will allow active transport to be more viable & accessible.	Accept	Key Issue 1
S623.022	Alistair Kwan	Natural Hazards/Climate Change	Oppose in part	Address noise and dust by not creating so much of it in the first placec: prescribe low-noise, low-abrasion road surfaces.	There has not been enough attention to the noise and dust caused by vehicles. This noise is largely optional, and insulating against it does not reduce the effect that it has on pedestrians and cyclists: road noise simply makes the city inhospitable, and requiring insulation along highways is ignoring the problem. The situation has become only more acute given (a) the recent observation that the vast majority of oceanic microplastics comes from car tyres, and (b) the expectation that, as temperatures increase, New Zealand roads will show ever more damage - notably potholes - because they are not designed for such conditions.	Reject	Key Issue 1
S626.011	Raine Estate Oaklands Ltd	Transport	Amend	Review and amend the cycle parking rules [REr.38A and AP10.4A] to ensure they are individually workable, practical, effective and allow for good outcomes to be achieved.	It is agreed that it is important to ensure neighbouring residential amenity is protected, particularly with regard to sunlight and daylight access, however there are some aspects of planning control that can be effectively left to the market to dictate, such as parking related controls.	Reject	Key Issue 5
S630.024	Ruby Hall	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					[Refer to the original submission for more detail]		
S630.025	Ruby Hall	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S630.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S630.026	Ruby Hall	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S640.003	Susan Smallcombe	Transport	Oppose	[Require] car spaces for residential flats / houses.	Some car spaces undergrounds were provided but not enough. Cars parked now block Nile Street so shoppers, funeral visitors, and NCMA have no spaces to park. However good public transport may become (new buses great) with family and kids [it is still] difficult not to have a car.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S640.004	Susan Smallcombe	Transport	Oppose	More roads closed and pedestrianised in CBD, e.g. Bridge Street.	Not stated.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S652.001	Graeme Tyree	Transport	Support in part	Simultaneously plan public and active transport improvements to support housing intensification [inferred].	I agree with the general intent of Plan 29, but suggest that NCC proceed with caution. It is important that intensification is first developed along with improved public transport services, to minimise atmospheric emissions from internal combustion engine vehicles. This would remove the need for car-parking spaces to be associated with new housing options. A compact urban landscape enables better and lower-cost public transport services. With compact urban design, active transport (walking and cycling) are more attractive options. With higher urban densification, there will be less transport congestion, since commuting from outlying suburbs will be reduced. People can live closer to their city workplaces.	Accept in part	Key Issue 2

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S652.011	Graeme Tyree	Transport	Not Stated	[Encourage] Waka Kotahi [to use] low-noise asphalt surfaces on roads close to dwellings.	Highway noise can be moderated by having Waka Kotahi using low-noise asphalt surfaces on roads close to dwellings. The transition to EVs will also further reduce traffic noise.	Reject	Key Issue 1
S658.005	Adam Hills	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S659.005	Lauran Allen	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S660.005	Anna Allen	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S661.005	Jasmine Smythe-Ross	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S662.005	Joe Caponte	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S663.005	Peter Smillie	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S664.005	Rachel Duke	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S665.005	Marianne Palmer	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.			
S665.034	Marianne Palmer	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S665.035	Marianne Palmer	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S665.034.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S666.005	Graeme Cowan	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development. I agree that one car park per unit should be supplied, there is not enough parking as it is.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S667.005	Ian Lash	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S669.005	Stuart Mayer	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development. Streets [will be] full of parked cars making it difficult to drive narrow streets. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S670.005	Mark Riley and Juliette Barrett	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S671.005	Ron van der Lem	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S672.005	Hilary van der Lem	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S673.005	Craig Helm	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S674.005	Ray and June Austin	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S675.005	Margaret Meechang	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S675.037	Margaret Meechang	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S675.038	Margaret Meechang	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S675.037.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S676.005	R. Sherrill	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S677.005	Justin Allen	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one off street car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S678.005	Angela Clark	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S679.005	Helena Barrow	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S680.005	Pamela Ferguson	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S681.005	Michael Curnow	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S682.005	Neil Hickling	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S683.005	Helen and David Murphy	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development. The roads are not wide enough to support extra car parking if none are provided with each house.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S684.024	Edward Short	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S684.025	Edward Short	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. Eg. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S684.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S685.024	Helen Winwood	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S685.025	Helen Winwood	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S685.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S686.024	Christopher Knox	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S686.025	Christopher Knox	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. Eg. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S686.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S687.024	Judith Bartsch	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S687.025	Judith Bartsch	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S687.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S691.001	John Walker	Residential Zones	Oppose in part	[Requests] this plan provides a percentage of parking depending on the height of the building.	No off street parking.	Reject	Key Issue 4
FS32.005	Peter Olorenshaw		Oppose	Reject	If you live close to urban centres or transport nodes and prefer not to drive why should you be forced to provide on-site car parking? Our vision is of a city where it is completely normal to visit friends and family by means	Accept	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					other than a car, so even visitors don't need to come by car. Forcing people and businesses to provide more car parking than they actually want or need has been a blight on this city like many others - reinforcing low density development, entrenching car use. People however need to be clear that they can not assume that there will always be car parking on the street outside their house.		
S696.006	John Munting	Transport	Oppose in part	Require provision of onsite car parking of at least two car parks per unit.	The Nelson City Council proposal hints strongly that the necessity of having cars will be minimal and with people walking to the inner city and local schools. Yes some people already do this but cars etc. are still required for other valid reasons. Buses for example are not an option due to the already substandard and periphery streets that are already clogged with vehicles.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S696.007	John Munting	Transport	Amend	Introduce a ban to disallow the likes of campervans, boats, trailers etc. to be parked off site.	Refer to reasons in submission point S696.006.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S700.019	Susan Hamilton	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive Car Parking Management Plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020, to mitigate these issues. This plan should be developed using a consultative approach involving representatives of Nelson's communities with differing interests who are committed to working together collaboratively to develop a co-agreed plan.	Increased intensification will result in more on-street car parking. The narrow streets of Nelson will become more hazardous for vehicles, pedestrians, mobility scooters, cyclists, E buses, refuse collection and emergency service vehicles. Neighbourly relations and communities could well become strained by increased parking and vehicle movements	Reject	Key Issue 4
S708.024	Harry Pearson	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S708.025	Harry Pearson	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S708.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S708.034	Harry Pearson	Transport	Oppose in part	[Seeks council] assess the implications of future garaging and carparking, which is not inlcuded in site coverage, taking up green space.	This will potentially have a dramatic affect on stormwater discharge from properties.	Reject in part	Key Issue 1
S708.036	Harry Pearson	Transport	Amend	[Seeks] council utilize smaller 6m long busses in as many areas as possible, as opposed to the current 12.5m long busses being used.	[This would] minimize the amount of car parking that is lost to bus stops, and bus access to those stops. E.g. on Moana Ave, which only has parking on one side of the road, 7 car parks are lost to just 1 bus stop.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S708.042	Harry Pearson	Residential Zones	Oppose	Oppose the proposed Tahunanui High Density Zone.	Traffic - The Tahunanui Hills is serviced by narrow winding streets which in our opinion are inappropriate to serve high volumes of traffic. NCC recently installed speed bumps along Tosswill Road to slow down traffic which uses this road as a thoroughfare to and from Nelson City. This road is very narrow and from our time living here, we have seen several incidents and near missess due to the narrow winding nature of the road where cars often cross the centre line. In addition,. accessing Tahunanui 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 weather it is appropriate. The same is likely for other infrastructure provisions to the area such as three waters servicing. There are several reoccurring slip zones onto Tosswill Road that make it even more dangerous.	Reject	Key Issue 1
FS72.041	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	Reject	Key Issue 1

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					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 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. The reasons for my support: The delivery of this plan has been a fundamental flaw and had no community buy in, the stress and hours spent trying to decipher has been unnecessary and extreme.		

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
FS60.033	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 from the hill the lack of sunlight could result in existing homes becoming dark and damp with associated mold and mildew.	Reject	Key Issue 1

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					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. The reasons for my support: The delivery of this plan has been a fundamental flaw and had no community buy in, the stress and hours spent trying to decipher has been unnecessary and extreme.		
S708.053	Harry Pearson	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be HDZ or MDZ.	Not stated.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S709.011	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Amend	Amend AD8.2.ii Resource consents General Information to be included with applications to include cycle parking and micromobility access information.	To be inclusive and more explicit in including cycle parking. Likewise the addition of micromobility to access.	Reject	Key Issue 5
S709.036	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support	Approve the changes to section DO10 District wide objectives and policies - Land Transport as notified.	NPHS-NM is supportive of the provisions under DO10 Land transport. Development of the road network needs to connect key growth areas with key public facilities such as the healthcare facilities, education facilities etc. It is important that the road network can accommodate public and active transport within these areas i.e. wide enough to have separated cycle lanes and bus lanes.	Accept	Key Issue 3
S709.037	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Amend	Introduce a new policy or provision into section DO10 Land transport as follows:**"Any new road network development, or re-development, connects key growth areas with key public facilities such as healthcare and education facilities and can**	Refer to reasons in submission point S709.036 and the original submission.	Reject	Key Issue 3

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				accommodate separated cycleways and bus lanes"			
S709.038	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support in part	Amend DO10.1.5.ii as follows: **Usable and safe** pedestrian and micromobility access to sites that do not have a vehicle access is important to ensure a well functioning urban environment and to provide a sense of location for each residential unit.	Support the addition of including access that provides safe entry and exit for pedestrians and micromobility. This addition is more inclusive of all users of the site and will support public health, wellbeing and social cohesion. It is important that access is 'usable' for people of all abilities - i.e. on sloping sections, it is important that access is configured in a way that allows safe and usable access for that site. We suggest additional wording to strengthen this provision.	Accept	Key Issue 3
S709.039	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Amend	Amend DO10.1.5.iv as follows: Rules that control subdivisions and developments to: a. require every site to be provided with vehicular, **pedestrian and micromobility** access.	Refer to reasons in submission point S709.038.	Accept	Key Issue 3
FS38.021	Small Time Developments	Transport	Oppose in part	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose in part are: Amend DO10.1.5.iv as follows: Rules that control subdivisions and developments to: a. require every site to be provided with vehicular, pedestrian and micromobility access. Requiring vehicular access goes against national guidelines and some developments should be allowed to cater for those who choose not to have a car and use other modes of transport. Support moving away from the dominance of cars and providing for those who choose not to have a car. Not every existing residential title in Nelson can physically have vehicular access.	Accept in part	Key Issue 3

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S709.040	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support	Approve the changes to policy DO10.1.6 parking, loading, and turning as notified.	The careful consideration of the impact(s) of these provisions on pedestrian, micromobility, and cycle safety will protect public health.	Accept	Key Issue 3
S709.041	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support in part	Amend the methods supporting policy DO10.1.7 as follows: • DO10.7.ii ... • DO10.7. iii Maintenance of separate, **accessible and usable** pedestrian **and micromobility** access between the parking squares and shopping streets. • DO10.1.7.iv Improvement of pedestrian **and micromobility** environment, particularly in shopping areas. • DO10.1.7.v Acquisition of **accessible and usable** walkways to create a network where adequate pedestrian **and micromobility** access on existing roads and walkways is not available • DO10.1.7 vi ...	Providing quality infrastructure that supports mode shift from vehicle use to alternative forms of transport will encourage and enable people to feel safe to make this transition. Improving the pedestrian and micromobility environment, establishing safe cycleways and providing end of user facilities will reduce barriers. Accessible networks, that are usable, are needed to meet the needs of mircomobility users. Disabled New Zealanders do not have the same access to public places and facilities as their non-disabled counterparts do. A significant part of the problem is that the built environment is not designed with the needs of all citizens in mind. We suggest strengthening these provisions to ensure networks are designed accessibly. Careful consideration is required for placement of cycle parking facilities. Secure cycle parking located at key bus stops could extend the catchment of eBus users. People who live away from the eBus route, could bike to a bus stop and feel safe knowing their bike was secured while they take the bus. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 3

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				• DO10.1.7 vii ... • DO10.1.7.viii Establishment of cycle parking facilities **appropriate for bicycles and e-bicycles and offer, where practical, lockable e-bicycle charging facilities, secured parking and lockers**.			
S709.042	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support	Approve method DO10.1.7.ii relating to pedestrian, micromobility and bicycle traffic as notified.	The addition of micromobility users is inclusive and will support positive public health outcomes.	Accept	Key Issue 3
FS38.022	Small Time Developments		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Approve method DO10.1.7.ii relating to pedestrian, micromobility and bicycle traffic as notified. Support moving away from the dominance of cars and providing for those who choose not to have a car.	Reject	Key Issue 3
S709.054	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Amend Policy DO13A.5.1 as follows: f.the consideration of connections to **active and** public transport or future **active and** public transport networks.	Refer to reasons in submission point S709.036 and the original submission.	Accept	Key Issue 3
S709.058	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support	Approve [as notified] policies and supporting provisions DO14.3.1 Roading, DO14.3.1.v and DO14.3.1.vii.	Support in full the addition of micromobility users and pedestrians into these provisions: DO14.3.1 Roading DO14.3.1.v DO14.3.1.vii. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Accept	Key Issue 3

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S709.072	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support in part	Consider amending the restricted discretionary criteria in rules REr.17B.3, REr.18B.3 and REr.19B.3 [and any other restricted discretionary criteria related to parking to specify that restricted discretion related to parking encompasses accessible parking]. Suggested wording as follows: REr.17B.3 Discretion is restricted to i: d. the ability to provide efficient parking **including accessible parking**, access and servicing on the site that supports high quality living environments;	Not stated. [Refer to the original submission for detail and context]	Accept	Key Issue 4
S709.104	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support in part	Amend ICr.31.4. h. ii Parking and loading Assessment criteria as follows: - Provision of sustainable transport fleet such as e-bicycles and e-vehicles. - Guaranteed ride home in the case of an emergency. - Employer purchase e-bicycle schemes.	Support in part ICr.31.4 Parking and loading Assessment criteria Guaranteed ride home is one of the easiest and most cost effective strategies to promote alternative transportation.	Accept in part	Key Issue 5
S709.105	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support in part	Approve ICr.32.1 inclusion of micromobility access requirements in the inner city zone.	Rule ICr.32.1 Support in full Adding micromobility enhances accessibility for all.	Accept	Key Issue 6
S709.108	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Inner City and City Fringe Zones	Support in part	Strengthen ICr.37B.4 New buildings and alterations and additions to buildings Assessment Criteria as follows: i. whether clearly defined and convenient pedestrian **and micromobility** access is provided from building entrances and tenancies from the street.	Strengthen to enable accessible design.	Reject	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				e. the effects on residential amenity values, in particular:**c. whether the residential units are usable and accessible for disabled people.**			
FS56.109	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora consider these requirements are too restrictive and do not provide for an appropriate level of housing choice.	Accept	Key Issue 6
S709.125	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support in part	Amend SCr.31.4 Parking and loading Assessment criteria to add:**d.the extent to which parking and/or loading areas allow for unobstructed emergency vehicle access.**	It is important that clear, unobstructed access for emergency vehicles is available. This is particularly important with the removal of car parks.	Accept in part	Key Issue 5
S709.140	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Entire Plan Change	Support in part	Include micromobility access in Open Space and Recreation Zone rule OSr.35 Access.	Include micromobility access to align with other sections of the plan.	Reject	Key Issue 5
S709.142	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support in part	Amend AP10.1.i Application of appendix 10 to add: For **Open Space and Recreation Zone :Accessible/mobility parking and cycle parking, must be provided where there are service buildings that provide services essential to the needs of the public, such as public toilets.**	Where service buildings exist within the Open Space and Recreation Zone, that are providing services essential to the public, such as public toilets, it is recommended these be required to have parking spaces accessible/mobility parking (for people with disabilities) and cycle parking.	Reject	Key Issue 5

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				Add **e. where micromobility access is provided mobility parking spaces should be considered.**			
S709.143	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support in part	Consider which terms is best used throughout the plan: accessible parking or mobility parking [and amend the relevant provisions accordingly].	It should be noted that "mobility parking" is the phrasing used by CCS Disability Action, the organisation responsible for issuing mobility parking permits.	Reject	Key Issue 10
S709.144	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support in part	Add to AP10.4.v Parking spaces for people with disabilities as follows: Accessible car park spaces must be provided as close as practicable to the accessible building entrance to the associated activity, and the most direct route from the accessible car park spaces to the activity must be **an** accessible **route as outlined in NZS 4121:2001 Design for access and mobility: Buildings and associated facilities, Section 4 - Accessible Routes.** The accessible spaces must be clearly signed and located to avoid conflict between vehicles and people using or moving to or from the space.	Support in part Support provisions of parking spaces for people with disabilities. Additional wording suggested to strengthen wording.	Reject in part	Key Issue 6
S709.145	National Public Health Service - Nelson	Transport	Support	Add to AP10.4.A.iv as follows: All required cycle parking must be located and designed in a manner that is:	It is important that cycle parking meets the needs of all cycles - for example, e-bicycles often have thicker tyres and cannot fit in some standard cycle parking.	Reject	Key Issue 5

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
	Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)			...**f.appropriate for a range of bikes, including e-bicycles. g.clearly signposted or visible to cyclists entering the site.h. not impeeding pedestrian thoroughfares including areas used by people whose mobility or vision is restricted.** And consider additional requirements of cycle parking to provide space to support the charging of electric bikes similar to electric vehicle supply equipment see AP10.4B.			
S709.146	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support in part	Approve AP10.4B End of trip facilities [inferred] and Consider adding provisions to Appendix 10 for e-bicycle charging facilities such as the Locky Docky system. This may be included in AP10.4B or better suited under cycle parking.	Support in part Support including lockers. Providing a secure, dry facility to leave items such as helmet and bike shoes will reduce barriers to mode shift. We support the exploration of e-bicycle charging facilities such as the Locky Docky system adopted in Auckland, which is solar powered.	Accept in part	Key Issue 8
S709.147	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Oppose in part	Approve AP10.5A electric vehicle supply equipment [inferred].	Support in part Support providing for car park spacing that supports the charging of electric vehicles. Electric vehicles are unaffordable for some people. E-bicycles, however, are a cheaper and healthier option. Consider providing for e-bicycle charging facilities as well, as mentioned in AP10.4B [Refer to submission S709.145].	Accept in part	Key Issue 5
S709.148	National Public Health Service	Transport	Support in part	Consider amending AP10.5B Lighting for parking spaces to include solar powered	AP10.5B Lighting for parking spaces	Accept in part	Key Issue 7

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
	- Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)			LED lights where appropriate and encouraging the community to choose solar- powered LED lights as an environmentally friendly option for residential and commercial use e.g. for security lighting. This could be included on NCC's webpage 'Sustainable at home".	Support in part Well-designed outdoor lighting installations can minimise light pollution and other environmental impacts while still providing adequate light for visibility and to support road safety. Solar-powered LED lights are a renewable source of energy and therefore have a much lower environmental impact than that of LED lights that are connected to the electricity grid.		
S709.149	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support in part	Amend AP10.15.2.i Assessment criteria as follows: Under a. Parking, queining and loading provisions include Vi.the extent to which the safety **and wellbeing** of pedestrians, particularly children, will be affected by the reduction or non provision of **parking,** queuing or loading spaces or by being set down on-street. And Add Under Maximum car parking**v. The impact on public health and wellbeing and access to healthcare services.**	Support inclusion of accessible parking and electric vehicle charging and lighting provisions, dedicated parking spaces for car-share/ride share. Support considering the safety of pedestrians. Recommend including wellbeing to ensure a more holistic assessment of community impact is considered in relation to these provisions as safety is only one aspect of wellbeing. Access to healthcare is a determinant of health. Having a maximum number of parking spaces at health facilities may become a barrier to people accessing healthcare.	Reject in part	Key Issue 5
S709.150	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support in part	Consider adding in additional reasons to AP10.16.5 (Reasons for rules Cycle parking and end of trip facilities) which support wellbeing. For example in E Tū Whakatū - Nelson Active Travel Strategy 2022-2032 ~~These will~~ To enable and encourage safe	Support reasons for rules under cycle parking and end of trip facilities.	Reject	Key issue 5

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				and convenient active travel, ~~*to reduce the reliance on cars, reduce carbon emissions,~~ and enhance the health and wellbeing of our community. *note strike through because this has been partly mentioned in AP10.16.5.i.			
S709.151	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support in part	Add to AP10.16.6.i Reason for rules Accessible parking as follows: To enable a well-functioning environment for people of all abilities, that provides for the special design, personal security, accessibility, **wellbeing** and convenience requirements of all users.	Support in part Well-functioning environments for people of all abilities has a positive impact on wellbeing for people and communities. NPHS-NM recommend referencing wellbeing as an important reason for the rules under accessible parking.	Accept	Key Issue 5
S709.152	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support in part	Add to AP11.i Overview - application of Appendix 11 as follows: For **Open Space and Recreation Zone: access to a site by micromobility access must be provided where there are service buildings that provide services essential to the needs of the public, such as public toilets.** And **f.where mobility parking for people with disabilities is**	Support provision to provide micromobility access to a site in Residential, Inner City and Suburban Commercial Zones. Where service buildings exist within the Open Space and Recreation Zone, that are providing services essential to the public, such as public toilets, it is recommended that accessible access is provided for people with disabilities in order to achieve an accessible route as per the NZS 4121:2001 Design for access and mobility: Buildings and associated facilities, Section 4 - Accessible Routes. It is important to link parking for people with disabilities and microbility access to a site to enable the person(s) safe mobilisation from the parked vehicle to the site.	Reject	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				provided.			
S709.153	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support in part	Add to AP11.3A.1Design of micromobility access as follows:**g.where the micromobility access includes steps, provide a step-free option as specified in NZS 4121:2001 Design for access and mobility: Buildings and associated facilities.** And amend wording to specify which part of NZS 4121:2001 Design for access and mobility: Buildings and associated facilities is being referred too. For example SECTION 4 - ACCESSIBLE ROUTES, specifically 4.3...	NPHS-NM noted it is not clear in NZS 4121:2001 Design for access and mobility: Buildings and associated facilities where the 'step-free option' is specified. Specifying the exact section(s) will enable greater clarity, efficiency and ensure the outcome of a well-functioning urban environment for people of all abilities is achieved.	Reject in part	Key Issue 6
S709.154	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support in part	Add to AP11.3A.1.iiDesign of micromobility access Restricted discretionary activities as follows: The extent to which the **wellbeing and** safety of pedestrians **and micromobility** users, both on and off the site will be affected. And/or**The extent to which the wellbeing of pedestrians and micromobility users will be**	Support in part Additional wording provided to strengthen provision. Note our proposed definition of wellbeing includes 'health and safety'.	Reject	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				affected should their access to the site be limited.			
FS56.115	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Oppose	Reject	Kāinga Ora does not consider these additions to the matters of discretion are necessary, and the existing drafting is supported to the extent that it is consistent with the primary submission.	Accept in part	Key Issue 6
S709.155	National Public Health Service - Nelson Marlborough, Te Whatu Ora (NPHS-NM)	Transport	Support	Approve AP11.7.5. i.	Support in full Providing access for pedestrians and micromobility users, of all abilities, to sites where vehicle access is not provided is important for community cohesion.	Accept	
S713.005	Cherilyn Barber	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned, especially those in the suburbs.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S714.024	Dorothy Siebet	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S714.025	Dorothy Siebet	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S714.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S715.024	Susan Ware	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for photos (Mt St 1-6 and Konini St 1&2) and more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S715.025	Susan Ware	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S715.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S715.026	Susan Ware	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S717.005	Cynthia Martin	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development. The area of concern is already heavily populated with cross lease titles. Further intensification will create parking chaos.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S719.013	The Domett St/Hardy St/ Tasman St/ Nile St block	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S719.014	The Domett St/Hardy St/ Tasman St/ Nile St block	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S719.013.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S726.005	John Bullock	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S727.005	Nicola Hawes	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S728.004	Linda Mace	Transport	Oppose	[Require] new builds to provide off street parking for at least one car per household as is currently required.	Congestion on our roads too is a concern. More housing, and particular multiple storey apartment complexes bring with them a rapid increase in vehicle movement, on roads that are already congested and slow during peak	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					times. More often than not households have two, or more vehicles. If new builds are not required to provide off-street parking, where do people charge their electric cars.		
S730.024	Stephanie Gray	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S730.025	Stephanie Gray	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. Eg. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point 23	Reject	Key Issue 2
S730.026	Stephanie Gray	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	for road safety reasons Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 1
S732.014	John Fitchett	Transport	Oppose	Oppose the inclusion of REr.38A relating to the provision of cycle parking.	Not stated.	Reject	Key Issue 5
FS83.173	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	Key Issue 5
S732.015	John Fitchett	Residential Zones	Oppose	[Amend the Residential zone rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided on site for each residential unit, and make any contravention of this condition a "Non- Complying" activity. Make sure that this amendment be made with wording that does not contradict the legislation proscribing requiring car parking to be provided.	I oppose the omission of any encouragement that carparks be provided in any new development in the areas proposed to be zoned High or Medium Density Residential Zone. If implemented the proposal will affect me, and the amenities I currently enjoy, personally and negatively, in that... if any of [my] four neighbours built apartments (with or without providing parking), the existing traffic problems in Examiner Street caused (or contributed to) - by cars dropping/uplifting Nelson College for Girls ("NCG") students before and after school, and - by cars dropping off/uplifting girls from the NCG Hostel at the start and end of weekends or Terms; and - workers in the CBD parking in the street, and Council's	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					decision to effectively have a sinking lid in respect of parking in the CBD and near the CBD; would be aggravated The Section 32 Report is defective in that in omits any detailed and objective comment - as to the loss of amenity (and future traffic hazard) to the area in the general vicinity of such a building: caused by vehicular traffic trying to find carparks. - as to the effect (on the proposed PC 29) of recent decisions by the Council to effectively impose a "sinking lid" on the provision of on-street or specified areas of carparking; and to remove on-street carparks for additional bus-stops and for other installations [Refer to the original submission for more detail]		
FS83.174	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	Key Issue 4
S732.027	John Fitchett	Transport	Oppose	Oppose rule ICr.31A prohibiting Private Carparking use in the Inner City Zone [sic].	I oppose rule ICr.31A prohibiting Private Carparking use in the Inner City Zone. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 9
FS83.186	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	Key Issue 9
S732.028	John Fitchett	Transport	Oppose	Delete rule ICr.31B requiring cycle parking to be provided and maintained on each site as part of any development [in the Inner City Zone].	I oppose rule ICr.31B requiring cycle parking to be provided and maintained on each site as part of any development. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 5
FS83.187	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	Key Issue 5
S732.029	John Fitchett	Transport	Oppose	[Delete permitted standard] ICr.32.l.b requiring the micro-mobility access being	I oppose rule ICr.32.lb requiring the micro-mobility access being required and maintained for each site as	Reject	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				required and maintained for each site as part of any development in the Inner City Zone.	part of any development. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]		
FS83.188	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	Key Issue 6
S732.052	John Fitchett	Transport	Oppose	Amend the plan change to reflect opposition to the changes to Inner City car parking and access policies as follows: • the addition and deletion in IC1.3.i and the deletion in IC1.3.iii, • the deletion of ICl.7.iv • the additions and deletion of ICl.9.i.	Not stated.	Reject	Key Issue 3
FS83.213	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	Key Issue 3
S733.005	Allan Barber	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned, especially those in the suburbs.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S735.012	Ulf and Eva Kerer	Transport	Oppose	[Traffic] concerns should be carefully considered when evaluating the potential consequences of a high-intensification plan, particularly in areas primarily consisting of single-level one-family houses. Mitigating these issues is essential to maintaining the safety and well-being of the community and ensuring that the neighbourhood remains a desirable place to live.	Increased congestion: High-intensification plans attract more residents and, consequently, more vehicles to the neighbourhood. This will lead to a significant increase in traffic congestion on the streets, making it challenging for residents to commute, access their homes, and navigate the area. The roads in [Mount St Hill] neighbourhood are too narrow to cope with any more traffic. Strain on infrastructure: Existing streets are not designed to handle the surge in vehicular traffic. This will result in wear and tear on the road infrastructure, increased maintenance costs, and potential safety hazards due to crowded streets.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					Parking issues: The influx of new residents will strain available parking options. It will become increasingly difficult for existing homeowners to find parking spaces near their homes, leading to frustration and inconvenience. Moreover, inadequate parking solutions can result in on-street parking, which may obstruct traffic flow and further exacerbate congestion. That new high-intensification housing does not require the developer to build adequate parking is beyond belief. Safety concerns: Increased traffic congestion will also raise safety concerns, especially if the neighbourhood has a high number of pedestrians, including children and the elderly. Narrow streets and crowded intersections will become more accident-prone, posing risks to both residents and visitors. [Refer to original submission for more detail.]		
S737.005	Mark Christieson	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S738.024	Sali Matthews	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S738.025	Sali Matthews	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S738.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S738.026	Sali Matthews	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	As a resident of Hampden Street, living opposite Nelson College and above Hampden Street School, I live in fear that a child is going to be injured, especially in the Melee that occurs around 3pm. As the streets are narrow, particularly Ngatiama St, with cars parked on both sides, the place becomes grid locked. School buses are barely	Reject	Key Issue 2

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					able to negotiate the roads, people in vehicles become impatient and children weave in and out of the chaos. If there is an emergency, delays may be life / property threatening. By allowing additional houses, with litle or no off street parking, the situation will become incredibly dangerous for children and slow emergency services more. It completely goes against the council policy of getting children to walk to school safely; it is simply unsafe. As a resident the chaos is incredibly frustrating, and to add more residents and vehicles without consultation and planning will most definitely create neighbourhood tensions.		
S740.005	Janet Southwick	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S741.005	David Gibson	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S742.005	David Worthington	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S742.009	David Worthington	Transport	Oppose	Build well-designed housing with some parking.	NN has reneged on removing the parking of residents' campervans, mobile homes, and caravans on the streets. Parking buildings are ugly, expensive and often dangerous, they would be totally out of place in a small city like Nelson.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S743.005	Ana Reyes	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S744.005	Judith Dix	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.			
S745.005	Rosemarie Manktelow	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S746.005	Melissa Short	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S748.024	David Smith	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S748.025	David Smith	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. Eg. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point 23	Reject	Key Issue 2
S748.026	David Smith	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	for road safety reasons Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 1
S750.013	Julie Carter	Transport	Oppose	Require provision for parking for new development [inferred].	In relation to 59 Wellington Street, the road is narrow and one-way at the southern end. As there is no provision for parking this will result in an overcrowded area with cars that will be a hazard for police, fire fighters, and ambulances, and make it less safe for children walking and biking to school.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S752.024	Helke Florkowski	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S752.025	Helke Florkowski	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S752.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S754.024	Jan Jordan	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S754.025	Jan Jordan	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S754.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S754.026	Jan Jordan	Transport	Oppose	Utilise smaller 6m long buses in as many areas as possible, as opposed to the current 12.5m long buses.	Minimise the amount of car parking that is lost to bus stops, and bus access to those stops. E.g. on Moana Ave, which only has parking on one side of the road, 7 carparks are lost to just 1 bus stop.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S754.052	Jan Jordan	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be HDZ or MDZ.	Not stated.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S755.012	Nelson North Limited	Transport	Support	Retain rule AP11 - 11.3.1.	The provision for rights of ways to be created with between 7 and 20 users is supported. This will not only reduce the number of consents required for rights of ways with more than 6 users, but also provide a more flexible framework that will support the needs of some forms of residential development.	Accept	Key Issue 6
S756.008	Lorraine Talley	Transport	Oppose	Oppose the omission of any encouragement that carparks be provided in any new development in the areas proposed to be zoned HDZ or MDZ.	Refer to reasons in submission point S756.001.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S763.005	Jilly Blackman Stevens	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S764.003	Elise Tull	Transport	Oppose	Provide total garaging as cars still an option.	No total garaging provided, as opposed to carparks.	Awaiting recommendation	
S766.032	588 Limited	Transport	Support	Retain rule AP11 - 11.3.1.	The provision for rights of ways to be created with between 7 and 20 users is supported. This will not only reduce the number of consents required for rights of ways with more than 6 users, but also provide a more flexible framework that will support the needs of some forms of residential development.	Accept	Key Issue 6
S767.032	Bayview Nelson Limited	Transport	Support	Retain rule AP11 - 11.3.1.	The provision for rights of ways to be created with between 7 and 20 users is supported. This will not only reduce the number of consents required for rights of ways with more than 6 users, but also provide a more flexible framework that will support the needs of some forms of residential development.	Accept	Key Issue 6
S768.027	Suffolk Heights Limited	Transport	Support	Retain rule AP11 - 11.3.1.	The provision for rights of ways to be created with between 7 and 20 users is supported. This will not only reduce the number of consents required for rights of ways with more than 6 users, but also provide a more flexible framework that will support the needs of some forms of residential development.	Accept	Key Issue 6
S769.010	Peter Fierek	Transport	Oppose	Implement off-street car parking to at least 1 car park per unit and prohibit parking on footpaths, make narrow roads safer by implementing no-stopping zones to make roads safer for all road users including pedestrians and cyclists.	Increased intensification without providing off-street carparking will result in more cars parked on-street enhancing significant hazards to pedestrians and road users in some areas of Nelson where roads are extremely narrow, with little or no footpaths, no berms, and no turning spaces. Some two-way roads are already down to single lane due to parking on one side or cars parked partly on footpaths.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S770.024	Wainui Properties Limited	Transport	Support	Retain rule AP11 - 11.3.1.	The provision for rights of ways to be created with between 7 and 20 users is supported. This will not only reduce the number of consents required for rights of ways with more than 6 users, but also provide a more flexible framework that will support the needs of some forms of residential development such as high and medium density.	Accept	Key Issue 6

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
FS78.555	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	Key Issue 6
S771.024	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S771.025	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S771.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S771.026	Trish and Charlie Goulter	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S776.024	Warwick Rogers	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S776.025	Warwick Rogers	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. Eg. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S776.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S778.024	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S778.025	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S778.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S778.026	Dr Hayden Thomas & Family	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S782.022	MGT Holdings Limited	Transport	Support	Retain [AP10.4A.1 Parking spaces for cycles].	This new rule requires 1 visitor parking pace per 20 beds and 1 secure long stay cycle parking space per 15 beds.	Reject	Key Issue 5
S782.023	MGT Holdings Limited	Transport	Support	Retain [AP10.4B End of trip facilities].	This new rule requires showers, accessible showers, and changing rooms for staff associated with the number of cycle and micro mobility parking spaces provided.	Accept	Key Issue 5
S783.005	Susan Gibson	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S784.005	Pauline Allen	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S785.005	Christine Hansen	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S785.025	Christine Hansen	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' to mitigate these issues.	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	Key Issue 4
S786.005	David Allen	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S787.005	Roger Wilson	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S788.005	Neal Rhodes	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S789.005	Barry Beams	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S790.005	Yvonne Beams	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S791.005	Simon Kelly	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S792.005	Michelle Viskovich	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S793.005	Charlotte Townsend	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S794.005	Deanna Chapman	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S795.005	Colleen Kidson	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.			
S796.005	Deborah Verdonk	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S797.005	Jocelyn Tucker	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S798.005	Ron Tucker	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S799.005	Heather McAlister	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S800.005	Jill Stevenson	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S801.005	Allison Tuckwell	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S802.005	Garry Way	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S803.005	Oxana Edmonds	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S804.005	Robert Edmonds	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S806.005	Selina Wilkinson	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S810.005	Robert Bruce	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S811.005	Narumon Glumglai	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S813.024	Lorna Sygrove	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S813.025	Lorna Sygrove	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S813.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S813.038	Lorna Sygrove	Transport	Oppose	Extend Market Road to join Brook Street.	[To] provide an alternative evacuation route and emergency service route between Bishopdale and upper Brook Street, which could also form part of the eBus route and provide cycle lanes. [To] divert traffic from Waimea Road and the City for those accessing Brook Street, the Brook Waimarama Sanctuary and the Brook Mountain Bike Park. [To] divert traffic traveling west from lower Brook Street and Seymour Avenue, Brougham Street, and Van Dieman Street routes. Refer to reasons in submission point S813.037.	Reject	Key Issue 1

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S814.005	S. Wastney	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S815.005	Janice Sowman	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S818.005	Anne Molloy	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S819.005	Catherine Larson	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S821.005	Michael Cooper	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S823.005	Chris Horner	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S825.005	John Harrison	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S826.005	Edwin Morris	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S829.005	Gabrielle Huygens	Transport	Oppose	[Request] secure and safe space to store electric bikes (in each unit or communal area). Also ideally there should be	Providing parking seems to be optional. In the Examiner Street area, the surrounding streets already have a significant shortage of street	Reject in part	Key Issue 5

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				provision for electric car parking and charging area, and maybe 1 or 2 electric cars available in a large building for residents to hire.	parking. I agree that the 15-minute city concept is important to foster so residents can rely on walking, biking and buses. People need to be mobile in modern society for their employment, getting to appointments, shopping and for their own recreation/mental health. Unfortunately Nelson is not large enough to specifically support commuting to work in many cases.		
S833.005	Marie Brodersow	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S834.005	Rosemary-Anne Gundry	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S837.005	Vernette Morris	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S838.005	Angeline Johnston	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S839.005	Norma Kaa	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S841.005	Sandra Burke	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S842.005	Lennane Kernt	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S842.010	Lennane Kernt	Transport	Oppose in part	[Suggests] 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.	Reject	Key Issue 1
S843.005	Diana Bowering	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S844.024	Hamish Neill	Transport	Oppose	Provide a comprehensive and credible "car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020, to mitigate against these issues.	Increased intensification without the requirement of providing car parking for residents will result in significantly more on-street car parking. This is already a big issue in may of Nelsons streets some of which have residents only parking already. 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	Key Issue 4
S844.025	Hamish Neill	Transport	Oppose	Council need to fully investigate ALL streets implicated in the plan and provide an explanation for the approval of significantly increasing on-street parking with the current street configuration OR increasing on street parking by altering the width and capacity of the street. If the latter is chosen, then an outline of who will pay for that street alteration should be made very clear. This should NOT be a ratepayer cost.	Refer to reasons in submission point S844.024.	Reject	Key Issue 3
S844.026	Hamish Neill	Mapping	Oppose	There should be NO INTENSIFICATION around any schools at all. Purely for safety reasons. It is a dangerous game of chance council are playing suggesting there would be no impact on safety for School Students with adjacent intensification.	For road safety reasons. As an example I draw your attention to Ngatitama and Ngatiawa streets in Nelson South. Both streets are in the zone for multi storey intensification. Ngatiawa Street is directly opposite a primary school. ALL of the school drop offs and pickups occur safely in this street and it is already at capacity twice a day. All that intensification will achieve is frustration, anger and an unsafe environment	Reject 1	Key Issue 1

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					for the small children to be dropped collected. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]		
S846.005	Suzanne Gibbons	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S847.005	Ian Faulkner	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S848.005	S Buttner	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S849.005	Margaret Trathen	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S850.005	N Mace	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S851.005	Stephen Gundry	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S852.005	John Gibson	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S853.005	Beverley Gibson	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S854.005	Craig Moore	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S855.005	Tracy Farrell and David Tyree	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S856.005	Pamela Goodin	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S857.005	Hubert Martin	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S858.005	Catherine Hughson	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S859.005	Diane Varey	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S860.009	Noah Hosie	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules] to ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be HDZ or MDZ.	I oppose the omission of any encouragement to provide carparks in any new development in the area proposed to be zoned HDZ. I oppose the absence of any detailed comment as to the loss of amenity (and future traffic hazard) to the area in the general vicinity of such [a HDZ building] caused by vehicular traffic trying to find a carpark.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S861.024	Wayne Pool	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]		
S861.025	Wayne Pool	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. .Eg. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S861.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S861.026	Wayne Pool	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S862.005	Stephanie Strawbridge	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S863.024	Carolyn Sygrove	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S863.025	Carolyn Sygrove	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S863.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S863.038	Carolyn Sygrove	Transport	Oppose	Extend Market Road to join Brook Street.	[To] provide an alternative evacuation route and emergency service route between Bishopdale and upper Brook Street, which could also form part of the eBus route and provide cycle lanes. [To] divert traffic from Waimea Road and the City for those accessing Brook Street, the Brook Waimarama Sanctuary and the Brook Mountain Bike Park. [To] divert traffic traveling west from lower Brook Street and Seymour Avenue, Brougham Street, and Van Dieman Street routes. Refer to reasons in submission point S863.037.	Reject	Key Issue 2

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S864.024	Richard Savill	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S864.025	Richard Savill	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S864.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S864.038	Richard Savill	Transport	Oppose	Extend Market Road to join Brook Street.	[To] provide an alternative evacuation route and emergency service route between Bishopdale and upper Brook Street, which could also form part of the eBus route and provide cycle lanes. [To] divert traffic from Waimea Road and the City for those accessing Brook Street, the Brook Waimarama Sanctuary and the Brook Mountain Bike Park. [To] divert traffic traveling west from lower Brook Street and Seymour Avenue, Brougham Street, and Van Dieman Street routes. Refer to reasons in submission point S864.037.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S865.005	John Molyneux	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
FS78.408	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).	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					The analysis (2015 methodology) that informs the Plan Change does not meet professional best practice.		
S866.024	Sarah Mitchell	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S866.025	Sarah Mitchell	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S866.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S867.024	Cameron Mitchell	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S867.025	Cameron Mitchell	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S867.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S868.024	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S868.025	Gaye Eleanor and Gordon Waide	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S868.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S870.024	Sara Cooper	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S870.025	Sara Cooper	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S870.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S871.024	Garry Cooper	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S871.025	Garry Cooper	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S871.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S873.024	Vincent Riepen	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
FS83.313	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	Key Issue 4
S873.025	Vincent Riepen	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S873.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
FS83.314	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	Key Issue 2
S873.026	Vincent Riepen	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
FS83.315	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	Key Issue 1

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S874.024	Ingrid Weeks	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S874.025	Ingrid Weeks	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S864.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S874.026	Ingrid Weeks	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S874.031	Ingrid Weeks	Transport	Oppose in part	[Seeks] council improve cycle ways and footpaths	So that non-motorists to commute with greater ease and safety.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S875.024	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S875.025	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. Eg. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point s875.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S875.026	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S875.031	Terry and Anna Rodgers	Transport	Oppose in part	[Seeks] council improves cycle ways and footpaths.	So that non-motorists to commute with greater ease and safety.	Awaiting recommendation	
S876.024	Brian Rodgers	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S876.025	Brian Rodgers	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. Eg. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S876.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S876.026	Brian Rodgers	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S876.031	Brian Rodgers	Transport	Oppose in part	[Seeks] council improve cycle ways and footpaths.	So that non-motorists to commute with greater ease and safety.	Reject in part	Key Issue 1
S877.024	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S877.025	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S877.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S877.026	Martin and Paula Hucklesby	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S879.014	Tasman District Council	Transport	Support in part	Amend the [AP10.4A] provisions so that in zones where communal cycle parking facilities are more important, then this is provided for in the rules.	The general provisions for requiring cycle parking are supported. However, it is questioned whether on-site cycle parking is appropriate in the Inner City Zone. This would require all sites (including inner city shops) to provide cycle parking. It is suggested that on-street or communal cycle parking facilities are a more efficient way of providing. Further analysis should also be undertaken to see whether on-site cycle parking is appropriate in the Suburban Commercial Zone.	Accept in part	Key Issue 5

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
FS56.132	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support	Accept	Kāinga Ora agrees with the submitter.	Accept in part	Key Issue 5
S879.015	Tasman District Council	Transport	Support	Retain the [AP10.4B] provisions.	End of trip facilities are supported.	Accept	Key Issue 8
S879.016	Tasman District Council	Transport	Support	Retain the [AP10.5A] provisions.	Electric vehicle supply equipment installation is supported.	Accept	Key Issue 8
S879.017	Tasman District Council	Transport	Support	Retain the [AP10.5B] provisions.	Lighting for parking spaces is supported.	Accept	Key Issue 7
S879.018	Tasman District Council	Transport	Amend	Retain the [AP10.14A] provisions with amendments to include Suburban Commercial Zone.	Maximum car parking numbers are supported, but consideration should be given to extending these requirements to the Suburban Commercial Zone. It is considered that SCZ is a key part of the NRMP framework for achieving a well functioning urban environment, and therefore the provisions should be extended to that zone, although the maximum car park numbers for that zone could be different to the Inner City Zones.	Accept	Key Issue 9
S881.028	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Transport	Support in part	Retain AP10.4A.1 Parking spaces for cycles as notified.	This new rule requires 1 visitor parking pace per 20 beds and 1 secure long stay cycle parking space per 15 beds.	Accept	Key Issue 5
S881.029	Manuka Street Hospital Limited	Transport	Support in part	Retain rule AP10.4B End of trip facilities as notified.	This new rule requires showers, accessible showers, and changing rooms for staff associated with the number of cycle and micro mobility parking spaces provided. MSHL considers this to be a positive method of enhancing useability of facilities and supports this requirement.	Accept	Key Issue 8
S885.024	Robert Stevenson	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S885.025	Robert Stevenson	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S885.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S885.026	Robert Stevenson	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S887.024	Carey Mason	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S887.025	Carey Mason	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S887.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S887.031	Carey Mason	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S891.002	John-Paul Pochin	Transport	Support in part	[Support] no minimum car parking requirements and requirements for cycle parking [as proposed in plan change 29] but consider infrastructure needed to support these [inferred].	There are some good elements in the plan, such as: No minimum car parking requirements and the requirement of cycle parking. Most amenities in our city should be accessible by bike, walking and/or catching the bus. These needs to go hand in hand with good infrastructure to support that; slower inner city speeds and car free streets, more bike paths, places for people to sit and rest if walking, for example.	Accept	Key Issue 4
S894.003	The New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Transport	Amend	Amend the assessment criteria for resource consents for four or more dwellings in the General residential zone (REr.17B.3) to enable consideration of whether modes other than private vehicles are provided for, including cycle garaging, travel demand management and accessibility of public transport stops.	Larger-scale developments should be encouraged to think more broadly about transport options for future residents. Travel demand management (e.g. shared home-office space, bookable vehicles), providing for alternative modes and connectivity to public transport should all be considerations in those applications. Waka Kotahi therefore seeks that an additional bullet point in the assessment criteria enabling consideration of whether modes other than private vehicles are provided	Accept	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					for, including cycle garaging, travel demand management and accessibility of public transport stops.		
FS56.135	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support in part	Accept in part	Kāinga Ora agrees with the submitter to the extent that the relief would relate to large scale multi-unit unit developments. However, Kāinga Ora has concerns regarding requiring such measures for any development of 4 or more units and would not support this relief until supported by appropriate s32 analysis, including analysis of costs and benefits. The application of the requested relief has the potential to be too restrictive.	Accept in part	Key Issue 6
S894.004	The New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Transport	Amend	Amend the assessment criteria for resource consents for four or more dwellings in the Medium Density Residential Zone (REr.18B.3) to enable consideration of whether modes other than private vehicles are provided for, including cycle garaging, travel demand management and accessibility of public transport stops.	Refer to reasons in submission point S894.003.	Accept	Key Issue 6
FS56.136	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support in part	Accept in part	Kāinga Ora agrees with the submitter to the extent that the relief would relate to large scale multi-unit unit developments. However, Kāinga Ora has concerns regarding requiring such measures for any development of 4 or more units and would not support this relief until supported by appropriate s32 analysis, including analysis of costs and benefits. The application of the requested relief has the potential to be too restrictive.	Accept in part	Key Issue 6
S894.005	The New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Transport	Amend	Amend the assessment criteria for resource consents for four or more dwellings in the High Density Residential Zone (REr.19B.3) to enable consideration of whether modes other than private vehicles are provided for, including cycle	Refer to reasons in submission point S894.003.	Accept	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
				garaging, travel demand management and accessibility of public transport stops.			
FS56.137	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support in part	Accept in part	Kāinga Ora agrees with the submitter to the extent that the relief would relate to large scale multi-unit unit developments. However, Kāinga Ora has concerns regarding requiring such measures for any development of 4 or more units and would not support this relief until supported by appropriate s32 analysis, including analysis of costs and benefits. The application of the requested relief has the potential to be too restrictive.	Accept in part	Key Issue 6
S894.009	The New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Transport	Support	Support the amendments to District Wide policy DO10.1.7: Pedestrian, micromobility and bicycle traffic.	Waka Kotahi supports the intent and content of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD). This Policy Statement recognises the national significance of having well-functioning urban environments that enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. The NPS-UD has a strong focus on ensuring that increased densities are provided in the most accessible parts of urban areas, where communities are able to access 'opportunities' such as services, education, employment and recreation by active and public transport modes.	Accept	Key Issue 3
FS38.032	Small Time Developments		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Support the amendments to District Wide policy DO10.1.7: Pedestrian, micromobility and bicycle traffic. Support moving away from the dominance of cars and providing for those who choose not to have a car.	Accept	Key Issue 3
S894.010	The New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Transport	Support	Support the amendments to District Wide policy DO14.3.1 Roading.	Refer to reasons in submission point S894.009.	Accept in part	Key Issue 3
S894.011	The New Zealand	Transport	Support	Support the amendments to District Wide method DO14.3.1.vii: Use of financial	Refer to reasons in submission point S894.009.	Accept in part	Key Issue 3

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
	Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)			contributions (Chapter 6) and/or LTP development contributions to acquire or upgrade vehicle, passenger transport, pedestrian, micromobility, cycling and amenity linkages where appropriate and not otherwise provided by the subdivision or development.			
S894.014	The New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi)	Transport	Support	Support residential rule REr.38A Cycle Parking: Cycle Parking must be provided and maintained on each site in accordance with the standards set out in Appendix 10 - Standards and terms for parking and loading.	Refer to reasons in submission point S894.009.	Accept	Key Issue 5
S897.024	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S897.025	Tiffany Fleetwood-Bird	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S897.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S898.036	Ryman Healthcare Limited	Transport	Amend	The RVA seeks for retirement villages to be either excluded from the bicycle parking minimums, or for the following standards to be applied as applicable: Table AP10.4A.1**Retirement villagesa. [Visitor Cycle Parking] N/Ab. [Secure Long Stay Cycle Parking] Minimum 1, 0.1 per staff member* (for retirement villages without a dedicated garage or basement car parking space).**	The RVA seeks amendments to Appendix 10 to exclude developments with a dedicated garage or basement space from bicycle parking requirements. The RVA opposes Table AP10.4A, as due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, it is not practicable to apply the minimum number of onsite cycling requirements to retirement villages at the same rate as it is applied to other residential activities.	Reject in part	Key Issue 5

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S899.024	Derek Austin	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S899.025	Derek Austin	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S899.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S900.024	Karen Austin	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S900.025	Karen Austin	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S900.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S901.035	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Transport	Amend	The RVA seeks for retirement villages to be either excluded from the bicycle parking minimums, or for the following standards to be applied as applicable: Table AP10.4A.1**Retirement villagesa. [Visitor Cycle Parking] N/Ab. [Secure Long Stay Cycle Parking] Minimum 1, 0.1 per staff member* (for retirement villages without a dedicated garage or basement car parking space).**	The RVA seeks amendments to Appendix 10 to exclude developments with a dedicated garage or basement space from bicycle parking requirements. The RVA opposes Table AP10.4A, as due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, it is not practicable to apply the minimum number of onsite cycling requirements to retirement villages at the same rate as it is applied to other residential activities.	Reject in part	Key Issue 5
FS50.035	MGT Holdings Limited		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: All parts. MGT Holdings fully supports the RVANZ submission	Reject in part	Key Issue 5

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					and, in particular, the background information providing context to that submission and the relief sought as set out within Appendix 1 of the RVANZ submission.		
S902.024	John Furtak	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S902.025	John Furtak	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S902.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S903.024	Nigel Perks	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S903.025	Nigel Perks	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S903.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S904.024	Katherine Waide	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S904.025	Katherine Waide	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S904.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S905.024	David and Clare Haig	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S905.025	David and Clare Haig	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S905.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S906.024	John Stone	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S906.025	John Stone	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S906.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S906.026	John Stone	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S907.024	James McNabb	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S907.025	James McNabb	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S907.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S908.024	Joel Collier	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S908.025	Joel Collier	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S908.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S908.026	Joel Collier	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S909.024	Judith Haywood	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S909.025	Judith Haywood	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S909.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S909.026	Judith Haywood	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S910.024	Myron Ouston	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S910.025	Myron Ouston	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S910.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S911.024	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S911.025	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S911.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S911.026	Katy (Jane) Kerby	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S912.024	Nicola Ouston	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S912.025	Nicola Ouston	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S912.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S913.024	Melanie Scott	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S913.025	Melanie Scott	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S913.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S913.026	Melanie Scott	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S914.024	Andrew Hume	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S914.025	Andrew Hume	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S914.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S915.024	Amanda Haywood	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S915.025	Amanda Haywood	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S915.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S915.026	Amanda Haywood	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S916.024	Emily Morgan	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S916.025	Emily Morgan	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S916.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S916.026	Emily Morgan	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S917.024	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S917.025	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S917.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S917.026	Elizabeth and Claire Woodall	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S918.024	Michelle Sowman	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S918.025	Michelle Sowman	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S918.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S918.026	Michelle Sowman	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S919.024	Gary Burns	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S919.025	Gary Burns	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. Eg. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point s919.024	Reject	Key Issue 2
S919.026	Gary Burns	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	for road safety reasons Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 1
S920.024	Pauline Miller	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S920.025	Pauline Miller	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S920.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S920.026	Pauline Miller	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S921.024	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S921.025	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S921.023.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S921.026	Saskia Roeske-Wout	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S922.024	Rick Miller	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S922.025	Rick Miller	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S922.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S922.026	Rick Miller	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S923.024	Tyler Hemi	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S923.025	Tyler Hemi	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S923.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S924.024	Shirley Burns	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S924.025	Shirley Burns	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S924.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S924.026	Shirley Burns	Mapping	Oppose	Restrict intensification in the neighbourhoods with narrow and hazardous road access to standard residential zoning.	For road safety reasons. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 1
S925.024	Nicole Gibson	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S925.025	Nicole Gibson	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S925.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S926.024	Nathan Gibson	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have	Reject	Key Issue 4

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					restricted road reserve. Refer to the original submission for more detail.		
S926.025	Nathan Gibson	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S926.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S927.024	Matthew Gibson	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S927.025	Matthew Gibson	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S927.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S928.024	Kade Smith	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S928.025	Kade Smith	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S928.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S929.024	Nichola Tyree	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]	Reject	Key Issue 4
S929.025	Nichola Tyree	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S929.24.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S932.024	Belinda Pooley	Transport	Oppose	Provide a 'Comprehensive car parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020.	Increased intensification without providing off street carparking will result in significant hazards to pedestrians and road users where roads are narrow or have	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					restricted road reserve. [Refer to the original submission for more detail]		
S932.025	Belinda Pooley	Transport	Oppose	Use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. E.g. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.	Refer to reasons in submission point S932.024.	Reject	Key Issue 2
S933.020	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Transport	Support	Retain Policy [DO10.1.7] as notified.	Kainga Ora support the promotion of alternative transport options and mode shift [as proposed in Policy DO10.1.7 Pedestrian, Micromobility, and Bicycle Traffic].	Accept in part	Key Issue 3
FS18.005	Rodney Albertyn, Principal Planner, NZ Transport Agency		Support	Accept	NZTA supports the promotion of transport options. A safe and convenient transport system for all modes of transport should be developed and maintained as an integral part of urban development.	Accept in part	Key Issue 3
FS38.038	Small Time Developments		Support	Accept	The particular parts of the submission we support are: Kāinga Ora support the promotion of alternative transport options and mode shift [as proposed in Policy DO10.1.7 Pedestrian, Micromobility, and Bicycle Traffic]. Retain Policy [DO10.1.7] as notified. Support moving away from the dominance of cars and providing for those who choose not to have a car.	Accept in part	Key Issue 3
S933.090	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Amend rule [REr.38] activity status from discretionary to restricted discretionary and include appropriate matters of discretion.	Kainga Ora support the rule [REr.38 Parking] framework but consider that non compliance with the rule should be restricted discretionary.	Reject in part	Key Issue 5
S933.091	Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities	Residential Zones	Support in part	Include non notification clause when contravening the rule [REr.38A].	Kainga Ora support this rule [REr.38A Cycle Parking] and activity status, but seeks that a non-notification clause is provided for contravening the rule.	Reject in part	Key Issue 5
S936.005	Susan Lovell	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4

Nelson City Council Plan Change 29 – s42A Report Table

Topic - Transport

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
S939.005	Era and Darryl Creevey	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S941.004	Peter Kortegast and Sue Ware	Transport	Oppose	Any housing unit must be required to provide onsite vehicle parking space.	We recommend any housing unit must be required to provide onsite vehicle parking space.	Reject	Key Issue 4
FS38.044	Small Time Developments		Oppose	Reject	The particular parts of the submission we oppose are: Any housing unit must be required to provide onsite vehicle parking space. Requiring vehicular access goes against national guidelines and some developments should be allowed to cater for those who choose not to have a car and use other modes of transport. Support moving away from the dominance of cars and providing for those who choose not to have a car. Not every existing residential site in Nelson can physically have car access.	Accept	Key Issue 4
S943.005	Louise Francis	Transport	Oppose	[Amend the rules to] ensure that at least one car park is provided for each residential unit in the areas presently proposed to be re-zoned.	I oppose the omission of any requirement to provide carparks in any new development.	Reject	Key Issue 4
S947.016	Nelson City Council	Transport	Support in part	Amend Appendix 11 to clarify how to calculate the number of residential lots accessing a private accessway for the purpose of standard AP11.3.	Clarity is needed over how to calculate the number of units or lots accessing a private accessway for the purpose of the proposed standard for private rights of way, especially in the context of the permitted standards REr.17B, REr.18B, REr.19B, which allow up to three units on a site, as of right. Should vacant residential lots be considered to contain three residential units, or one residential unit (unless a greater number of units has obtained a building or landuse consent, in which case that number shall be used).	Reject	Key Issue 6
FS57.016	Susan Hamilton and David Macdonald		Support in part	Accept	The submission details "the potential adverse effects of taller buildings on the function around amenity of public open spaces" - these include "shading of publicly accessible areas and wild effects".	Reject	Key Issue 6

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Plan Section	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer Recommendation for PPC29	Report Section
					If it is of value to protect public reserves that are used intermittently and by choice, then it is vastly more important to protect privately owned residential properties that are lived in and enjoy the current sunshine and environment 24/7.		