

Online submission

This is a submission that was made online via the Council's website.

Submitter No.	S21
Submitter Name	Emma Newcombe
Submitter first name	Emma
Submitter middle name	Mary
Submitter surname	Newcombe
Submitter is contact	Yes
Email	emmanewcombe@gmail.com
Wish to be heard	Yes
Joint presentation	Yes
Trade competition	I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
Directly affected	N/A
Withhold contact details?	No

Submission points

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

Documents included with submission

None

Online submission

This is a submission that was made online via the Council's website.

Submitter No.	S22
Submitter Name	mark sherlaw
Submitter first name	mark
Submitter surname	sherlaw
Submitter is contact	Yes
Email	marksherlaw@hotmail.com
Wish to be heard	Yes
Joint presentation	No
Trade competition	I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
Directly affected	N/A
Withhold contact details?	No

Submission points

Plan section	Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
Residential Zones	High Density Residential Zone	Oppose in part	The new plan change 29 is not very well thought through. The areas for intensification really need looking at .At this early stage the areas cover too much ground, the high density areas need to be smaller rather than right through the city. I also feel the land along the Matai River on both sides should really be "LOW DENSITY" it is one of the most beautiful parts of Nelson and a great joy to the many people that use it. At present it is an open/ green/social/recreational area and its openness is its greatest virtue it doesn't need to be denigrated with cheap box like houses which happens all over the world with high intensification of houses. I have also read-up on the statistics and I really cannot see where this huge demand for housing is coming from. Nelson was not mandated by the Labour government to increase housing as were the larger cities. Some intensification maybe desirable in some areas but once we have built over and around the areas that are a draw card to live in Nelson we then just end up with yet another built out squalid little city.	Limit the areas of housing intensification rather than the huge area proposed, some areas are suitable but not all the area in the plan change.

Documents included with submission

None

Online submission

This is a submission that was made online via the Council's website.

Submitter No.	S23
Submitter Name	Robin Holmes
Submitter first name	Robin
Submitter middle name	James Patrick
Submitter surname	Holmes
Submitter is contact	Yes
Email	robin.holmes@cawthron.org.nz
Wish to be heard	No
Joint presentation	Yes
Trade competition	I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
Directly affected	N/A
Withhold contact details?	No

Submission points

Plan section	Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
Residential Zones	Medium Density Residential Zone	Oppose in part	Catering for housing intensification in Nelson is important to provide more affordable homes for young families. However, the proposed southern boundary of the Medium Density zone in The Brook trisects a shared driveway with four properties into three zones. As proposed, two of these properties would be medium density, one would be general residential and a fourth zoned rural. Housing intensification if done well preserves the character of the surrounding suburb and enables a smooth transition between dwelling types. The proposed boundary would put medium density housing directly adjacent to both rural and residential areas, this would create a stark transition and a cluster of mixed of housing styles. I therefore request that the boundary be made simpler by removing 87b and 87a from the planned Medium Density zone. Thanks for your consideration of this point. Yours Sincerely, Robin Holmes	The proposed Medium Density Residential Zone currently includes 87b and 87a Brook St along its southern boundary, this change would mean these dwellings abut Rural zoned areas, and in the case of 87b, both rural and residential areas. I request that the southern boundary on the east of The Brook excludes both the 87b and 87a Brook Street properties.

Documents included with submission

None

Online submission

This is a submission that was made online via the Council's website.

Submitter No.	S24
Submitter Name	Richard Russell
Submitter first name	Richard
Submitter middle name	John
Submitter surname	Russell
Submitter is contact	Yes
Email	judge.russell@justice.govt.nz
Wish to be heard	No
Joint presentation	No
Trade competition	I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
Directly affected	N/A
Withhold contact details?	No

Submission points

Plan section	Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
Entire Plan Change	General opposition	Oppose in part	see above.	I am not against progress or infill development as such but I consider the proposal to allow the intensification of the Medium and High Density areas as shown in the plan with a maximum building height equivalent to almost the height NCC's own headquarters in Trafalgar St and the Rutherford Hotel without resource consent processes applying and with people not being able to have their say, runs a serious risk of seriously damaging and endangering community and amenity values which are so important for the residents in Nelson. To allow buildings of up to 6 stories in the areas proposed without proper consultation and consideration of the impact on immediate neighbours and the surrounding community without the people affected being able to be heard and have their say, is divisive and plainly wrong. The principles of natural justice and people having the right to be heard about matters affecting them and their community seems to be ignored in the Plan Change proposed. I seek for 3 stories for buildings in the High Density and 2 stories in the Medium density areas to be the maximum permitted height limit as of right . 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. The existing sunlight and sideyard provisions should be retained, but able to be addressed by people affected in the course a transparent hearing and decision making process. I would urge Council to give these aspects of Plan Change 29 much closer scrutiny than would have appear have occurred so far. For these reasons I oppose Plan Change 29 in its current form

Documents included with submission

None

Online submission

This is a submission that was made online via the Council's website.

Submitter No.	S25
Submitter Name	Claudia Bustos Lee
Submitter first name	Claudia
Submitter middle name	Andrea
Submitter surname	Bustos Lee
Submitter is contact	Yes
Email	melon_claudia@hotmail.com
Wish to be heard	Yes
Joint presentation	No
Trade competition	I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
Directly affected	N/A
Withhold contact details?	No

Submission points

Plan section	Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
Entire Plan Change	General support	Support	We need more homes in Nelson!	Go ahead with the plan and build up! We need more homes!

Documents included with submission

None

Online submission

This is a submission that was made online via the Council's website.

Submitter No.	S26
Submitter Name	Eddie Allnutt
Submitter first name	Eddie
Submitter middle name	Peter
Submitter surname	Allnutt
Submitter is contact	Yes
Email	eddiekiwi@hotmail.com
Wish to be heard	Yes
Joint presentation	Yes
Trade competition	I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
Directly affected	N/A
Withhold contact details?	No

Submission points

Plan section	Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
Entire Plan Change	General opposition	Oppose		Plan 29 is cancelled and a more considerate plan is developed.

Dear Senior Planning Administrator,

I do find the Plan 29 flawed. So flawed, I reject it in its entirety, but if it is not rejected then here are my feelings.

Firstly, this has caused my family and I a lot of stress. We live on Locking Street which is a MDZ under PC 29 (MDZ on that unstable hill! You've got to be joking but I'll touch on that later). However, as the crow flies, we live 25 metres away from a Kainga Ora property (4 Examiner/57 Wellington Street which is HDZ under PC 29).

I have talked to Kainga Ora and they have told me that that development is on hold until the outcome of PC 29. One can only imagine that they only want to go higher than their original plan of 3-storeys!?!

While I understand the need for social housing, it would be not right and very unfair to cause the loss of the current sunshine we get and to put us in shade! Please note, in the winter, we lose the sun behind the Mount Street Hill in the early afternoon. We don't won't to lose it in the morning also!

I also have a view looking out to Church Hill and it would not be right and very unfair to cause the loss of that. After all, that's why we purchased the property!

Parking: 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 the 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 taking 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.

We would not like to further lose our privacy and peacefulness either and have more people looking down on us and making noise on our

street and nearby streets. We already have enough drunk people causing damage and disruption on narrow Locking Street. A big social housing block in our area isn't going to make things better.

I am also concerned about the rest of the city and believe careful planning and design needs to be done if Nelson is to be intensified. It needs to be done with care and respect for existing residents. Nelson should be a beautiful city and have its own style. Not quickly and cheaply designed by developers out to make a buck. Residents shouldn't be pitted on each other so a well thought out plan needs to be made. Made with input of the local residents and actual architects/designers who care about now and the future. We local residents need to be consulted and our views taken into serious consideration.

I would like to it made easier for a tiny home or a granny flat be added to existing properties so intensification is done with blocking people's sun and views. These would be single storey.

Below are some other points and an expansion of some points raised above.

The Plan Change 29 Process.

That I have found it difficult to digest the total effect of the proposed PC 29 and its supporting documentation due to its size and complexity.

That access to a paper copy of PC 29 and the Section 32 reports has not been made available for residents who do not have access to, or the ability to use a computer.

That I have found PC 29 lack of early public engagement and consultation by Council, with its severe implications towards the well-being of existing rate paying residents enjoyment of their properties, extremely stressful and unnecessary.

That I have been put in a position of hoping more qualified citizens than I, will make more comprehensive submissions covering my concerns as to the future of Nelson and its ratepaying residents.

That Council Planning Staff have stated at numerous meetings "This is a 'Broad Brush approach' that requires public submissions to

refine the plan . Such a statement implies PC 29 has been prematurely put out for public submissions in an incomplete and inaccurate state that requires the public to learn and understand its entirety, so they can re-design it. I am asking Council to withdraw PC 29 and get Council Planning staff to refine the plan design and then put it back out for public submissions.

Hearing Panel

I strongly disagree with the make-up of the hearing panel, because of its 'biased' public perception following the vote on Councillor Courtneys proposal to withdraw PC29 at the 14th September Council meeting.

I ask the Council to appoint Councillors from either side of the Sept 14th vote.

NCC's Population forecasts

These are a pivotal aspect for the scale of which Nelson needs to enable intensification and growth. The forecasts used by NCC are not Statistics NZ medium projections, but are over inflated projections that require the scale of intensification to be greater than those of Statistics NZ.

I ask the Council to use Statistics NZ medium projection forecasts, as recommended by the NPSUD Capacity: Guide on Evidence and Monitoring, para 2.1.1 and amend its intensification requirements accordingly.

Design Lead and Not Developer Lead Growth. Nelson is a very special and unique place that needs to be protected with care. It is unlike any other district in NZ. It includes a 'Low Rise' City with a collection of heritage and non-heritage character buildings that have attracted people for generations and been a cherished holiday destination for many New Zealanders.

Residential Neighbourhoods should be protected for future generations to enjoy and new developments thoughtfully designed and planned on a neighbourhood, by neighbourhood basis to maintain the essence of their character.

We need to protect and retain CBD historic facades as an essential part of the character of the Inner City.

Contemporary Black Iron Clad Boxes, built only a few metres from 120-year-old Historic

Homes is a thoughtless lack of long-term vision for maintaining the attraction of Nelson for all the future residents and visitors. Green Spaces, Trees and Landscaping are essential for the look and feel of some of our older neighbourhoods. They help considerably with the wellbeing of the residents and help to provide an essential part of the attraction of Nelson, which must all be considered during developing the growth of Nelson.

I ask the Council to create a broader level of protection for neighbourhoods beyond the heritage buildings and precincts that still have historic character value from the early settlement years of Nelson.

I ask the Council to appoint an Urban Development Agency (UDA) to carefully guide growth and actively facilitate the emergence of cohesive urban neighbourhoods with a variety of high-quality housing choices.

Sunlight Recession Planes and Shading Effects

Sunlight is a CRITICAL part of living in Nelson. It is not called the 'Sunshine Capital of NZ' for no reason. It is well documented that people relocate to Nelson because of the Sun and accept reduced wages called 'Sunshine Wages' for that privilege.

TDC even 'Encourage the Sun into your home'. See <https://www.tasman.govt.nz/my-property/building-and-alteration/heating-and-insulation/energy-efficiency-and-heating-your-home/>

All existing houses built prior to and under the current daylight admission rules will be subjected to the loss of sunlight amenity under PC29 with the following effects: -

Increased levels of mental health illness, anxiety and stress.

Increased levels of damp homes with associated mould and mildew and respiratory illnesses.

Shadowing of 'Green Energy' Solar Arrays and Passive Solar Energy Heating.

Increased heating costs, air pollution, carbon foot print, are all exasperated due to a large portion of Nelson housing is old, with un-insulated walls and single glazing and open fires were legislated out of use many years ago. Reduction in property values and increased financial stress, because the house would be less desirable to live in.

Residents, struggling with the cost-of-living

crisis may not afford to heat their home. Property owners will be reluctant to invest in making additional new (low rise) infill improvements on their section, with affordable additional units that COULD be over shadowed and devalued by a wealthier developer who could afford to build a multi-storey development next door at any time in the future.

I ask the Council to maintain the AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.

I strongly support the inclusion of Daylight and Sunlight policy statement Para RE2.3.i: The reception of daylight and sunlight to each household unit is a critical component of residential amenity that provides warmth and energy efficiency, and is vital for outdoor activities such as gardening and recreation. To ensure shading effects are minimised, and to ensure there is sufficient space around buildings to allow the admission of daylight to the site, this Plan has provided for daylight controls on all side and rear boundaries. The policy also applies to larger non-residential buildings such as schools or halls. The basic premise is that the daylight and sunlight received on a residential site should be no different whether or not the neighbour is residential. This philosophy applies whether the building is on an adjoining site or across a street.

Privacy and Outlook

Privacy is a critical part of enjoying a property.

I support the inclusion of RE2.4.iii, but ask Council to add the following [bracketed] words. 'The building Act controls windows in walls of buildings on or close to boundaries and the outlook rules ensure that residential units [and their neighbours] have a reasonable degree of privacy as well as encourage residential units to be orientated towards the street or public open space'.

Intensification

I strongly oppose the High-Density Residential Zone. It is by no way in character or in keeping with any existing 'Low Rise' Nelson residential suburb and beyond the MDS legal mandate.

I ask Council to remove HDRZ from the plan completely.

I ask Council to apply the new General Residential Zone equally across the entire Nelson district on the introduction of PC29, on the basis that AP15 Daylight Admission protection rules will apply to all pre-existing properties, unless the owner gives written approval to the contrary.

I am strongly opposed to all new 'Green Field' developments being used for only single storey dwellings as it is a complete underutilisation of land that can accommodate increased intensification.

I ask Council to ensure a minimum of two storey dwellings be built on all new green field developments. Eg Golden Elms in Toi Toi, Ngawhatu Valley and Marsden Valley.

Building holiday apartments that sit empty for long periods, does not solve our intensification, growth and affordability dilemma, and yet it locks up our valuable housing resource. Eg Rocks & Haven Road has many empty apartments.

I ask Council to consider solutions to mitigate against new-build empty holiday apartments.

I oppose the increase of residential units beyond 4, as a restricted discretionary activity that does NOT require notification and written approval from neighbours.

I ask Council to ensure that more than 4 units requires notification, to restrict large 'out of character' accommodation blocks spanning multiple sections, and taking up lots of on street car parking spaces, popping up in a residential street, without warning.

Bigger older properties, could be better utilised and help with our growth if they were more easily allowed to be divided into multi-dwellings.

Building inner city apartments that offer an alternative solution to 'retirement villages', can free up the bigger homes for new families to occupy. The 'retired' occupants may also be less likely to be reliant on a vehicle, which may more closely suit the growth model desired.

Designing Inner-City roof gardens and balconies with green spaces for commercial hospitality use or places for apartment living residents to relax and enjoy the Nelson Sun. Incentivise rate paying residents to demolish or relocate their house in favour of replacing more units on the same section providing they comply with the suitable character or heritage of the neighbourhood.

Progressively Phased Intensification

Firstly, Inner City should be the starting place to have the most significant intensification, before forcing it onto the residential neighbourhoods, this can give more time to complete a better design vision for our residential neighbourhoods.

I ask Council to make better utilization of Car Only spaces, by developing them into shared spaces, with Accommodation overhead.

'Nelsust' highlights 44% of the Inner City as Car only spaces.

I ask Council to retain para ICd.11 'The zone enables and encourages an increase in the density and diversity of quality housing in the City Centre by enabling residential activity above ground floor level. It is expected that over time, more people will choose to live in the City Centre because of its easy access to offices, shops, entertainment and varied open spaces and experiences'.

Secondly, City Fringe would be the next zone to phase in for intensification.

Finally, the Residential Zones would be the last area to be phased in, by working out from the City Fringe Zone (and Central Stoke).

I would support Medium Density Residential Zones (3 storey 11m high) progressively expanding from the CBD (and Central Stoke) if required and over time, providing AP15 Daylight Admission Protection rules remain in force for existing properties.

Intensification in hazard zones

I ask Council to apply no greater than General Residential Zoning rules in all Hazard overlays, because these areas have been assessed as vulnerable and given that we are in a climate crisis, with increasing record-breaking weather events, affecting increasing areas of Nelson in ways not seen before then, I believe those areas should be treated with caution.

On-street carparking

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.

I ask Council to provide a 'Comprehensive car

parking management plan' as strongly encouraged by Policy 11 of the NPSUD 2020, to mitigate against these issues.

I ask Council to use traffic calming solutions that do not lose on-street car parking spaces. Eg. Speed Humps, instead of Choke Points.

Social Housing

Significant care and attention must be considered with all social housing because there are too many examples across the country where this has resulted in disharmony in communities.

High density living for the homeless and vulnerable will not result in healthy outcomes for all concerned.

Careful design controls from the concept stage onwards, will be rewarded in the long run, with less support required by Mental Health Services, Charity Services, Police and Social Services.

I would like to see Council working closely with Kainga Ora, to provide a 'transparent' way of creating new Social Housing Developments that 'Fit' with the long-term design vision of Nelson.

I would like to see Council have more fit for purpose controls for antisocial behaviour that affects the existing neighbour's enjoyment of their property.

Infrastructure

I ask the Council to include a plan to mitigate against future drought situations with a greater demand on the same amount of water from the Maitai Dam, for a greater population. I ask the Council to include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for our waste water systems.

I ask the Council to include a plan to mitigate against the increased capacity requirements for storm water.

As for the the "Mount Street Hill"(Mount St, Konini St, Locking St and Wellington Streets, between Kerr St in the north, Wellington St and Renwick Place to the east, Locking Tce and the walkway to Vanguard St to the south, and extending at several points to Vanguard St in the west)

Due to the instability of the land and the narrow streets this should be considered to be

low density, not medium density. It should be made easier to build a "granny flat" or drop in a tiny home in this area but not to build up new 3 storeys. I've elaborated a little more below.

Reasons

1 Description of the Mount St Hill

The Mount St Hill is an old suburb. It takes the form of a long, narrow, steep sided ridge lying north to south with a narrow crest, except where this broadens slightly towards the top. It contains about 250 existing homes, mostly older.

2. Rooding

2.1 The rooding pattern was cleverly designed to traverse across the steep slopes at a gentle angle, swinging from side to side of the hill and over the crest, rather than going straight up the very steep sides of the hill. This results in there being two long roads, Mount St and Konini St, and three shorter ones, Renwick Place, Locking St, and Wellington St. The main spine route consists of Wellington St from the east, Mount St along the crest of the ridge and Konini St to the west. There are shorter branches of this spine at Renwick Place, Locking St and a parallel branch of Mount St which is separated by a steep bank from the rest of the street. There are two tight 180 degree bends where the main route swings to the other direction, at the intersection of Mount St and Wellington St, and near the intersection of Mount St and Konini St. . There are only two practical road exits from the hill, at Examiner St to Rutherford St on the eastern side and at Gloucester St to Vanguard St to the west. Locking St has an awkward, narrow exit to Tipahi St to the south, but the street is so narrow and visibility so limited at the top that this is scarcely used, except perhaps by residents of Locking St who have reason to go to the south. There are three walkways off the hill, all steep and with steps.

2.2 The roads are all much narrower than would be expected under modern standards, and are long, sometimes winding and mostly poorly equipped with footpaths and on-street parking. There are no turning heads on the side branches. There are narrow grass verges in a few places which tend to be used for parking cars. It would be impossible to widen any of the roads without either deep excavations into the fragile steep slopes or

high retaining walls or both. Both of these would either cut off or over-steepen the numerous existing private driveways. In numerous places the carriageways provide only a single lane to serve two way traffic, sometimes with the ability to provide on street parking on one side only. Narrow footpaths exist in places but are largely absent and are frequently intruded on by parked cars occupying part of the footpath to make space on the roadway. As a result drivers must carefully share the roads with each other, cyclists and pedestrians, frequently having to pause where there is available space to allow vehicles to pass. Sometimes this requires driving over the kerb onto footpaths. In places trucks, including the weekly waste collection vehicles have to reverse quite long stretches because of the lack of anywhere to turn. In places, visibility of oncoming vehicles is very poor, such as towards the lower end of Mount St going downwards.

2.3 Most existing houses have drive on access and parking. There are considerable numbers of vehicles parked on the streets, particularly overnight and at the weekends as obviously households often have multiple vehicles, and visitors. Driveways are frequently angled across the road frontage including on the unformed the road reserve, reducing the opportunity for road widening.

2.4 Exit points and congestion

The two main exits from the Mount St Hill. at Examiner and Vanguard St are already difficult to turn out of at busy times, even to the left, With the significant levels of development proposed, severe congestion and delays at these exit points would inevitably result, with temptations to take dangerously short gaps. It is already not unusual to find oneself in a short queue to turn right and experience delays of several minutes. Further development must inevitably increase such delays and these could become considerable. Traffic signals would assist the exiting traffic but at the cost of creating more delays on Rutherford St and Vanguard St. Rutherford St in particular cannot afford this as it is part of the Waimea Rd route, one of only two southbound routes away from the centre of Nelson and already heavily congested.

3. Development Capacity Under Proposed Zoning

3 1 There are approximately 250 homes on the

Mount St Hill. The theoretical capacity under the Medium Density Zone would therefore be approximately 2250 homes (3 buildings per property x 3 units per building x 250). Under the General Residential zoning this would be 1500 homes, (250 x 3 x 2).

3 Rear sites, accessibility and safety.

3.1 There is vacant land on the hill, mostly behind the existing rows of houses along the roads. Virtually all of this land is very steep. At the lower end of Konini St there is vacant land directly off the street. It is almost a cliff, and numerous slips can be seen here, yet it is zoned Medium Density Residential. Here would be impossible to develop, and this reinforces our suspicion that this zoning proposal has been a desktop exercise with no detailed, expert examination of feasibility. Even a simple site visit on foot would have demonstrated this.

3.2 Development of the other vacant land would almost inevitably be on a site by site basis. The vacant land is almost all very steep. Even if existing houses were demolished and replaced, very steep driveways along the side boundaries would be required to leave room for building sites. Fit people only could walk these, without carrying very much at all. This comment is based on our own direct experience of one of the very few existing such driveways off Mount St, where friends lived until recently. One of the elderly couple had not walked up it for 20 years, and his wife only because she was exceptionally fit and healthy. Drive on access is also necessary for parents of young children, unwell or disabled people and the elderly. We challenge the ability of almost anyone to push a wheelchair or child in a buggy up one of these driveways or get safely down it. Even if people are able to walk on and off, it is still a long way from Mount St to the central city where services, work and entertainment and other destinations exist. There is no public transport. 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.

4 Parking

4.1 Although on-site parking is no longer able to be mandated, we consider it would be necessary, for the original construction and ongoing maintenance of homes, and for the comfort and convenience of the occupants. 4.2 Even if walk on access only is provided, it is our opinion that such dwellings would be unattractive to most purchasers, and difficult to sell. Therefore this form of development is likely to be unattractive to developers.

5. Development constraints

5.1 Because most development is likely to be on a site by basis, we consider that development is only likely to be possible in most cases if existing front houses are demolished, because of the need to provide vehicle access to the rear of the sites. This would reduce the economic viability or attractiveness of such development. We accept that most of the existing housing is old, but almost all of it appears to be well-maintained and in good condition.

5.2 Almost all of the land on the Mount Street Hill, except along the ridge line on either side of Mount St has been categorised by the Council as a Slope Stability Constraint Area. In due course this is to be incorporated in the NRMP. Owners have been notified of this by letter. I strongly question the wisdom of such intensive development to the proposed levels on such steep erosion-prone land that has been acknowledged by the Council to be unstable. Conventional building platforms would require deep excavations into these fragile slopes and high retaining walls, which themselves require additional space. The same applies to parking space. A possible alternative would be to have foundations on poles, for both buildings and parking. This is unlikely to be viable for three storey buildings. Building development on these slopes will require

careful attention to stormwater runoff because it would concentrate the runoff and could cause scouring at the site or on properties below. This runoff should be collected and piped to the nearest publicly available system, which would need to be adequately sized to cope with quicker and larger peak flows. It may be necessary for pipes to cross neighbouring properties, and those owners may not be receptive to allowing that.

6. Non-notification issues

We consider that if this zoning is confirmed it would enable a large development capacity as of right. Therefore any applications for departures from this to enable even more intensive development should be notified to neighbours.

7. Hearings panel issues

I am concerned with both the size and makeup of the appointed hearings panel. Because there will be many submissions it is likely that from time the elected members on the panel may know submitters personally, creating potential for conflicts of interest and a need to withdraw from the hearings on that matter. It is possible that only the independent panel member would be available to hear such a submission. The Christchurch City Council is currently processing a similar Plan Change for urban intensification. It has recognised this possibility and has appointed an Independent Hearings Panel of five members, none of whom are elected councillors.

Because of past decision making on the Future Development Strategy, both Councillors will have formed at least a preliminary opinion about the need for urban intensification in the form proposed. No doubt they would be able to change this mindset, but it may take more to convince them to do so than if they were to come to the case with no previous views.

With respect we consider that the Nelson City Council has overstated the importance of local knowledge on the hearings panel. There are many highly qualified and experienced Hearings Commissioners in New Zealand who can and do come into hearings and focus on local issues of importance, guided by reporting officers and submitters. The issues in the case are not unique to Nelson, and similar urban growth plan changes are taking place all over New Zealand following the introduction of the

National Policy on Urban Development and the introduction of the Residential Medium Density Standards. To us, it is much more important that the Commissioners have the training and experience to engage with technical experts and understand and apply technical expert considerations and evidence on technical subjects, including in this case traffic and geotechnical engineering. We suggest that the Hearings Panel should have at least four and preferably five members with a quorum of three, and no more than one elected member.

Conclusion

Despite the deficiencies of the roading system, it is workable with the existing level of development. Residents are used to it and it is usually possible to pause somewhere to let other traffic through if necessary. The area has a lot of interest and charm and is a pleasant attractive place to live in its present form. I strongly question the wisdom of attempting intensive residential development on steep unstable land such as this. We do not expect it will ever be possible to achieve the theoretical housing levels on the very steep available land, but some new development would inevitably occur and we consider that the existing streets will accommodate only a small fraction of the theoretical capacity without severe impacts on the safety, convenience and general amenity of the area. We are sure that the Council would not permit a new subdivision for several thousand homes with such an inadequate roading system and consequently do not see why it should be enabled on an existing suburb.

For all these reasons I seek that the zoning of the Mount St Hill remain for low density housing.

I strongly recommend that the Hearings Panel conduct a thorough site inspection of the Mount St hill, including on foot.

Regards,
Eddie Allnutt

Online submission

This is a submission that was made online via the Council's website.

Submitter No.	S27
Submitter Name	Yvette Byrd
Submitter first name	Yvette
Submitter middle name	Robyn
Submitter surname	Byrd
Submitter is contact	Yes
Email	yvettebyrd1930@gmail.com
Wish to be heard	No
Joint presentation	Yes
Trade competition	I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
Directly affected	N/A
Withhold contact details?	No

Submission points

Plan section	Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
Entire Plan Change	General opposition	Oppose in part	The need for housing can be achieved without taking away the rights of existing residents. Without forcing people to live under either the reality or the threat of being loomed over by a multi-storey building. When I bought my house I looked long and hard to find a house with privacy and sun. It feels like an abuse of power to threaten to take that away without my consent. I have family members who have benefited directly from social housing in Nelson. The house they were placed in had sun and privacy. It was truly a lifesaver. I am pro housing, I am pro social housing. One or two story, controlled, well designed infill makes a lot of sense. Thoughtfully designed higher structures in the CBD or in areas where sun angles and privacy allows, makes a lot of sense. Even 6 story structures in new subdivisions where tenants and owners are aware of the environment they will be living in, makes sense. Putting a large proportion of our population under permanent threat of being overshadowed and having their privacy taken away is an abuse of power. Personally it feels like a spectre hanging over me and is already causing anxiety and lost sleep. I'm sure it doesn't compare to housing insecurity or homelessness but I'm not saying I don't want homes for all. Am I. Leaving the future of much of our city in the hands of profit driven developers is madness. What could possibly go wrong?	I am against allowing 3 and 6 story buildings in established residential areas. I believe there are many alternatives to this to address our housing crisis. Single/Double story infill. Higher buildings in the CBD. Higher buildings in future subdivisions, so tenants and owners are aware of the environment they will be living in.

Documents included with submission

None

S28

Voided

Online submission

This is a submission that was made online via the Council's website.

Submitter No.	S29
Submitter Name	Janet Southwick
Submitter first name	Janet
Submitter middle name	Elizabeth
Submitter surname	Southwick
Submitter is contact	Yes
Email	baywicks@xtra.co.nz
Wish to be heard	Yes
Joint presentation	No
Trade competition	I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
Directly affected	N/A
Withhold contact details?	No

Submission points

Plan section	Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
Residential Zones	High Density Residential Zone	Oppose	see above	Plan 29 My concerns are as follows My home, on the Maitai and Brook is in a flood zone, half the street is single family and 10 house down the street we are considered High density. A 3-6 story building along my fence line would block all of my sun and I have now decided to cancel my solar panels as my roof would not receive any winter or summer sun. The Sun provides vital vitamin D especially for children and older people, and lack of it will have adverse effects on residents overall well being. It also will shade my small productive vegetable garden. Further there is presently a parking problem in our area and with the 'infill' it is irresponsible to plan these buildings without at least a minimum 1 parking space per unit. I feel the 'planners have just thrown a 'blanket' over all of Nelson without any real thought or planning. While urban development is essential for progress we must also preserve the unique character and quality of life that small residential areas offer. There is no guarantee it will lead to more affordable housing and developers will capitalise on the demand for urban living. The planners need to pick 'certain sites' for development rather than ruin existing neighbourhoods. Infrastructure, traffic congestion, lack of green space should also be considered. This plan needs to go back to the drawing board.

Documents included with submission

None

S30

Voided