

## Draft Nelson Plan

### Public Engagement October to December 2020 – Summary of Feedback

Prepared February 2021

Topic	Summary of feedback
<b>Air</b> <i>(This chapter was not released as part of public engagement on the Draft Nelson Plan. Feedback has however still been received on this topic.)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Three responses from residents looking for more flexibility in the current approach to low emission wood burners in Airshed A.</li><li>• One response supports current policy and seeks that vehicle pollution be addressed in the new chapter.</li></ul>
<b>Climate change</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Thirty-seven responses, most of whom are Nelson residents or interest groups. Three responses were from government agencies.</li><li>• Majority agree with climate change being in the Draft Nelson Plan but seek greater integration and consistency across chapters.</li><li>• Majority support Council leadership and recommend a climate change action plan, adaptation and/or mitigation.</li><li>• Many provide suggested strategies for climate change adaption and mitigation.</li><li>• Numerous comments state that climate change should be integrated throughout the Draft Nelson Plan as they consider that current provisions are inconsistent across chapters.</li><li>• Many seek to work collaboratively with Council, including Waka Kotahi.</li></ul>
<b>Coastal hazards</b> <i>(This chapter/topic was not released as part of public engagement on the Draft Nelson Plan. Feedback has however still been received on this topic.)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Twelve responses, five from specific interest groups.</li><li>• Feedback recognised the need for:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ modelling and risk assessment,</li></ul></li></ul>

Topic	Summary of feedback
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ long term planning, including the development of the climate adaption strategy, to assist in the integration of different hazards, development pressures, critical infrastructure, and protection of natural features and habitats of indigenous biodiversity, and</li> <li>○ Plan provisions relating to the management of coastal hazards, particularly inundation.</li> </ul>
<b>Coastal marine/ Coastal environment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twenty-seven responses (including four from government agencies) on a wide variety of topics.</li> <li>• General support for protection and restoration of the coastal environment (particularly in relation to water quality in estuaries resulting from land based activity effects).</li> <li>• Other comments include/seek: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ no further reclamation of estuaries and lack of appropriate recognition of estuaries,</li> <li>○ restoration of coastal habitats, biodiversity and expansion of Horoirangi Marine Reserve,</li> <li>○ concern regarding sediment loss affecting the coastal environment,</li> <li>○ no net loss approach in relation to water quality,</li> <li>○ allocation of coastal space (e.g. incentives for sharing of boats in the marina),</li> <li>○ area of land for small boat users,</li> <li>○ implications of outstanding coastal natural character landscape provisions on Pepin Island,</li> <li>○ alignment with Ministry for the Environment microbial water quality guidelines,</li> <li>○ implications of widening SH6 Rocks Road, and</li> <li>○ various minor amendments to provisions.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Feedback has been received in relation to boat launching areas and public access to the coast (in particular numerous responses with regard to Delaware Bay and Cable Bay), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ provision for access,</li> <li>○ retention of Delaware Bay boat ramp for public use, and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Topic		Summary of feedback
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ safety of launching boats at Cable Bay and other sites.</li> <li>• Recognition that coastal land is also held in private ownership and used for farming purposes, that there is potential for reverse sensitivity issues, and seek clarification regarding farming activities in the coastal environment.</li> <li>• Department of Conservation (DoC) has provided extensive feedback on a wide range of matters including provisions relating to alignment with the NZCPS.</li> <li>• Feedback from parties with an interest in aquaculture seeking further discussions with Council regarding the industry.</li> </ul>
<b>Commercial zones</b>	<b>City centre zone</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seventeen responses received.</li> <li>• Support for pedestrianisation of Trafalgar St (and other parts of the CBD), provision of laneways for improved circulation and greater links to the natural environment, provision for a range public amenities, and greater greenery in the city centre.</li> <li>• Support for more residential living.</li> <li>• Buildings heights – some requests for increase height to 30m, others requested reduction to 11m.</li> <li>• Request for flexibility for buildings to be set back from the road.</li> <li>• Request to stop vehicle access ways/loading bays crossing the pedestrian footpath.</li> <li>• Request for the City centre zone to be extended to include all of the Maitai Precinct area (west of current library).</li> <li>• Amend objective relating to amenity values to align with NPS-UD.</li> </ul>
	<b>Mixed use zone</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eleven responses received.</li> <li>• Minor changes are sought, most of which are generally supportive.</li> </ul>
	<b>Local centre zone</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four responses received, all seeking changes, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ eastern side of Tahunau Drive be zoned "Neighbourhood Centre Zone" to keep character of Tahunanui,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Topic		Summary of feedback
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ review height consistencies of existing Suburban Commercial Zone and the proposed Local and Neighbourhood centre zones,</li> <li>○ provision for supermarkets and increase permitted floor area, and</li> <li>○ amend objectives and policies relating to amenity to align with NPS-UD.</li> </ul>
	<b>Neighbourhood centre zone</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Seven responses received, all seeking changes, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ rezone 117-179 Vanguard (Victory Vet Clinic) and eastern side of Tahunanui Dr to Neighbourhood centre zone,</li> <li>○ amend the role of the Neighbourhood centre zone to include wording relating to 'wider community passing through the neighbourhood',</li> <li>○ amend policy to include reference to preventing disturbance of sleep, and</li> <li>○ amend objectives and policies relating to amenity to align with NPS-UD.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Contaminated land and Hazardous substances</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Feedback received from Nelson Marlborough District Health Board (NMDHB) generally in support, with some minor changes suggested.</li> </ul>
<b>Development areas</b>	<b>Maitahi development area</b> <i>(This chapter was not released as part of public engagement on the Draft Nelson Plan. Feedback has however still been received on this topic.)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 145 responses - 132 of which are opposed to the Development area.</li> <li>● A petition signed by 260 people opposing the Maitahi development was received as feedback from "change.org – Campaign to Save the Maitai".</li> <li>● While most feedback supports the concept of intensification, many disagree with a re-zoning of the area.</li> <li>● Issues raised in opposing feedback include that the area is a Significant Natural Landscape, infrastructure is inadequate and the decline in water quality.</li> <li>● Supporters suggest it is a good use of land but would need to support any development with appropriate infrastructure.</li> </ul>

Topic		Summary of feedback
	<b>Saxton development area</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Six responses received.</li> <li>• NMDHB are supportive but seek stronger wording for a "requirement" rather than "encourage" approach to a new shared path to the Main Road Stoke.</li> <li>• Some oppose the development area on the whole while others support the development area, with amendment sought to the location and number of sub-collector road connections.</li> <li>• Radio NZ seek to ensure the radio transmitters can continue to function without any reverse sensitivity.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b>Earthworks</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Six responses, predominantly from business, interest groups and/or government agencies.</li> <li>• General support for earthworks controls.</li> <li>• Recognition that earthworks and vegetation clearance are part of the rural working landscape.</li> <li>• Numerous feedback relating to the need for better integration of earthworks provisions across the different Nelson Plan topics (such as landscape, biodiversity and cultural heritage) and better alignment between 'regional' and "district' roles and functions.</li> <li>• Specific requests made to improve policy wording and the numeric values determining status of consents.</li> <li>• The need for better alignment with National Policy Statement for Plantation Forestry is raised.</li> </ul>
<b>Ecosystems and biodiversity</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twenty-two responses, primarily from Nelson residents or interested groups.</li> <li>• A number of feedback notes that greater clarity is required to distinguish between the terrestrial ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity chapter, and those chapters relating to the estuarine, coastal and marine space.</li> <li>• A number of feedback raises that offsetting provisions require refinement and consistent integration across Plan chapters.</li> <li>• Several responses also seeks greater alignment with the Draft NPS-IB and the NZCPS.</li> </ul>

Topic	Summary of feedback
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several responses received seeks general refinement of the Plan provisions.</li> <li>• Specific feedback relates to the identification of Significant Natural Areas (SNA), in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ three in relation to the removal of an SNA,</li> <li>○ three request amendments to an SNA boundary,</li> <li>○ a few are concerned about the process of identifying and assessing SNAs, and</li> <li>○ a rate remission for identified SNAs or consideration of Council purchasing these sites is also raised.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Several responses seek inclusion of additional provisions to manage indigenous biodiversity outside of an SNA.</li> <li>• Sufficient protection of indigenous biodiversity is sought while permitting rural activities which provide for rural character and productive lands.</li> </ul>
<b>EIT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sixty responses received, of which about 80% relate to transportation.</li> <li>• Feedback addresses the need for Council to reprioritise away from providing for private motor cars, to alternatives, including public and active transport.</li> <li>• More cycleways, improved connections between centres, and upgrading existing roads with safer pedestrian and cycleway access are requested.</li> <li>• The counter has also been represented, that 'better roading infrastructure is a necessary consequence of growth', and accessibility for all is important.</li> <li>• Rocks Road and the Inland Route access development issue is raised. The historic, amenity and aesthetic values of Rocks Road is identified and the value of the railway reserve for continued use as an active transport route is also raised.</li> <li>• Creating pedestrian friendly City Centre spaces free of motor cars is supported.</li> <li>• Parking is a common theme, relating to discouraging car use. On-road parking is noted as being dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.</li> </ul>

Topic	Summary of feedback
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic volumes, intersection management and neighbourhood amenity along Nile Street and the Maitai Valley Road is raised by 'Save the Maitai' advocates.</li> <li>• Congestion suggestions include densification, charging, charging for parking, and providing for public transport options.</li> <li>• Climate change is raised, e.g. resilience of infrastructure, reduction of carbon emissions, renewable energy sources, energy efficiency, and clean energy.</li> <li>• The development, operation, maintenance and upgrade of regionally significant electricity infrastructure, is raised. As is the alignment with the National Policy Statement - Electricity Transmission and National Environmental Standard – Electricity Transmission.</li> <li>• Wastewater, water supply and stormwater management provisions are raised in relation to climate change resilience and, and poor state of existing networks.</li> <li>• A request to add to the list of 'regionally significant infrastructure' has been received from telecommunications, key Oil infrastructure, and health/hospital facilities.</li> <li>• Infrastructure investment into the Glenduan area (to allow for further development) is requested.</li> </ul>
<b>Forestry</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Five responses received, four raising water quality concerns in relation to sediment loading, particularly from forest harvesting.</li> <li>• Questions raised regarding if the Nelson Plan needs to be more stringent than the National Environmental Standard – Plantation Forestry /if the National Environmental Standard –Plantation Forestry is strict enough.</li> <li>• Feedback from forestry industry raise that there does not appear to be sufficient and clear recognition of the NES-PF regulations, causing activities to inadvertently require consent.</li> </ul>
<b>Freshwater</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fourty responses, most of which are of general nature, with a handful requesting specific amendments to provisions. Almost half of feedback received is from Nelson residents indicating support for better freshwater management.</li> </ul>

Topic	Summary of feedback
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some acknowledge the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020, noting that draft Nelson Plan content does not fully reflect all aspects of this new National direction.</li> <li>• Overall, high degree of support for the direction of draft changes has been received.</li> <li>• Support for improved land management, controls on water takes and steps to address contamination.</li> <li>• Specific concerns raised include/relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the current state and trend of freshwater health,</li> <li>○ forestry and 'mono-culture' (including pasture), and the effects of erosion and sedimentation on water health, and siltation of waterways,</li> <li>○ subdivision effects on freshwater, and</li> <li>○ the health of the Maitai.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Importance of riparian vegetation management is noted and the need for ample riparian land area adjoining streams (to allow for quality and flood management objectives).</li> <li>• Water conservation, including the requirement for rainwater collection and storage, is raised.</li> <li>• The absence of knowledge about permitted takes is noted and the metering of all takes has been requested.</li> <li>• Consistency with other Councils' approaches is also sought, for users operating across boundaries.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Growth and intensification - general comments</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over ninety responses received, with the majority from individuals resident in Nelson.</li> <li>• The majority of feedback supported growth and, in many instances, intensification.</li> <li>• Numerous feedback opposed the proposed Maitai development but supported growth in other areas of the city.</li> <li>• Many commented on need for integration strategies addressing transport, neighbourhood amenity and infrastructure or made links to areas such as quality design, hard and soft infrastructure, heritage, medium density development, housing affordability, climate change, street trees, transport modes, lot size and building heights.</li> <li>• One party suggests Hira as a future development area.</li> </ul>



Topic	Summary of feedback
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some feedback provided comments on additional areas for intensification.</li> </ul>
<b>Heritage</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Forty-three responses received, majority is from Nelson residents or landowners in addition to heritage professionals and government agencies.</li> <li>Some support for specific provisions is provided.</li> <li>Clarification or minor amendments of provisions is sought, in addition to some more substantive changes to Plan provisions.</li> <li>Eight requests opposing specific listings have been received.</li> <li>Some feedback is concerned about heritage values associated with the Maitahi development, with two requesting that the Maitai valley be listed as heritage.</li> <li>Some feedback seeks to preserve the special character of the Fairfield area, which in some instances is referenced as “heritage character”.</li> <li>One is opposed to establishing special character areas.</li> <li>Some requests seek changes to the heritage design guides.</li> <li>Conflicting feedback received regarding protection of the building interiors.</li> <li>Heritage NZ also advocated establishing ‘heritage areas’.</li> </ul>
<b>Hospital zone</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NMDHB seeks changes to the standards and policy support for comprehensive residential development of surplus land.</li> <li>Manuka Hospital seeks a Special Purpose Hospital Zone for its campus.</li> </ul>
<b>Industrial zones</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Four responses received, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two which seek zone changes,</li> <li>One requests minimum cycle parking standards for development, and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Topic		Summary of feedback
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ One seeks minor clarification of provisions.</li> </ul>
<b>Iwi</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nine responses relate to iwi issues in the Draft Nelson Plan.</li> <li>• Opposition to Māori content (use of te reo and to customary access applying to Māori specifically).</li> <li>• Sites and areas of significance to Māori should be verified by an archaeologist.</li> <li>• Consideration that directing the mauri be enhanced is too stringent (as may not be possible).</li> <li>• Remaining feedback relates to ensuring that Council meets its obligations as a Treaty partner.</li> </ul>
<b>Light</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two responses received.</li> <li>• Waka Kotahi - NZTA supports all Light provisions including recognition of reverse sensitivity effects.</li> </ul>
<b>Marina precinct</b> <i>(This chapter was not released as part of public engagement on the Draft Nelson Plan. Feedback has however still been received on this topic.)</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three responses received, two of which seek provision for varying degrees of future development of the area, including providing for marine service and supply businesses, commercial activities, residential development and parking.</li> <li>• One feedback also seeks future expansion of the Marina.</li> <li>• One feedback raised concerns relating to the management of the marina and pollution, and seeks sustainable processes.</li> </ul>
<b>Natural character, features and landscapes</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thirty-eight responses received.</li> <li>• Twenty-four request the Maitai valley be added as an Outstanding natural feature or landscape, or alternatively cite landscape values in their opposition to its potential development.</li> <li>• A few seek specific amendments or more leniency to the provisions.</li> <li>• Seven relate to specific properties within a landscape overlay.</li> </ul>
<b>Natural hazards</b>	<b>Overview</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total of thirty responses received in relation to Natural hazards.</li> </ul>

Topic	Summary of feedback
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General support for the Plan provisions relating to Natural hazards.</li> </ul>
<b>Fault rupture</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twelve received, generally from residents that disagree with the location/extent/identification of the overlay on their property.</li> <li>• A number seek that the setback remain at 5m and not the proposed 10m.</li> <li>• Kainga Ora supports the general approach of 'management' over 'avoidance' but supports 'avoidance' approach in relation to subdivision or development that will 'significantly' increase the risk to peoples health and safety.</li> </ul>
<b>Liquefaction</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Five responses received, four of which are in support.</li> <li>• Agreed that buildings in liquefaction areas should be suitably designed.</li> <li>• The reference to 'single' being a permitted activity should be removed to be more enabling for other typologies that could.</li> <li>• Objective does refer to the risk to the natural environment.</li> </ul>
<b>River flooding</b> <i>(This chapter was not released as part of public engagement on the Draft Nelson Plan. Feedback has however still been received on this topic.)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twelve responses received.</li> <li>• Suggestion that natural hazard land progressively be retreated and used for recreational uses.</li> <li>• Provision sought for relocatable housing in these areas, not just increased floor levels.</li> <li>• More non-statutory methods are sought, such as planting more trees to absorb excess water entering streams.</li> <li>• Support for division of general and high flood risk areas.</li> <li>• Consistency with NZCPS is raised as being needed.</li> <li>• Noted that Objectives need to be broader than just considering the risk to people.</li> <li>• Amendments are sought to the definitions of 'flood tolerant' and 'flood sensitive/hazard sensitive activities'.</li> <li>• Kainga Ora supports the general approach of 'management' over 'avoidance', but supports 'avoidance' approach in relation to subdivision or development that will 'significantly' increase the risk to peoples health and safety.</li> </ul>

Topic		Summary of feedback
	<p><b>Slope instability</b></p> <p><i>(This chapter was not released as part of public engagement on the Draft Nelson Plan. Feedback has however still been received on this topic.)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Five responses received.</li> <li>• It has been raised that the area within the NRMP Grampians Slip area should not be zoned Medium density zone.</li> <li>• Request received to plant more trees to hold hillsides together.</li> <li>• Raised that areas at risk should be progressively used for recreational areas.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Wildfire and drought</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback response raised that works need to continue with area along flooding, increasing the resilience and access to water storage.</li> <li>• Feedback from a forestry company requests provisions that relate to fire and vegetation clearance, fire ponds, temporary use, urban areas and setbacks.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Noise</b></p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seven responses received.</li> <li>• Two are concerns about the noise level set for residential areas.</li> <li>• One is concerned about the permitted noise levels for events at Founders Park.</li> <li>• One raises concerns with highway and traffic noise in residential areas.</li> <li>• NMDHB has provided detailed feedback, in particular expressing that they do not consider provisions to adequately control environmental noise affects on public health. They have sought a redraft and simplification of the chapter.</li> <li>• Waka Kotahi - NZTA supports provision for recognition of reverse sensitivity impacts and protection of operational requirements of existing activities, such as the State Highway. They seek implementation of a buffer area with associated provisions.</li> <li>• A forestry company seeks amendments to provide for the NES-PF in the noise provisions.</li> </ul>

Topic		Summary of feedback
<b>Open space zones</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seven responses received.</li> <li>• Brook Waimarama Sanctuary seeks better provision for activities at the Sanctuary visitor entrance area.</li> <li>• One feedback emphasises the need to provide good quality urban open space.</li> <li>• Remaining feedback seeks minor changes.</li> </ul>
<b>Public Access</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three responses received.</li> <li>• General support for walking and cycling access, connectivity, and opportunities for community connection to/with nature.</li> <li>• Issue of accessibility to a wider range of mobility types is raised, and that health and safety risks need to be addressed.</li> </ul>
<b>Plan introduction</b>	<b>General</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correct identification and consistency to a number of mana whenua specific matters is sought, including mana whenua entities, principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, spelling, protocols, tikanga, and place names.</li> </ul>
	<b>Definitions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thirteen responses received, from government agencies, interest groups and businesses.</li> <li>• The majority of feedback seeks amendment of proposed definitions, with some seeking the addition of new definitions.</li> <li>• The definition for 'Regionally significant infrastructure' is raised by a number of parties.</li> <li>• DoC has provided detailed feedback, specifically in relation to definitions for 'no net loss' and 'biodiversity corridor', in addition to seeking the addition of a number of new definitions and expansion of other proposed definitions.</li> <li>• A forestry company has provided detailed feedback in relation to ensuring consistency with the NES-PF.</li> <li>• Two parties seek the addition of a definition for retirement village.</li> <li>• One party seeks clarification on the difference between the definition for 'Minor residential unit' and 'Residential unit'.</li> </ul>
<b>Port Nelson</b>	<b>Port zone</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Port Nelson Limited seeks a number of changes to the objectives, policies, activities and standards to:</li> </ul>

Topic		Summary of feedback
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ recognise the port as 'Nationally significant infrastructure'; and</li> <li>○ clarify the activities supported (Port industrial and accessory activities) and those that are discouraged (such as non-Port industrial, residential other than caretaker, marina).</li> </ul>
	<b>Port noise</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four responses received, two of which seek a complete review of all the noise provisions relating to port noise.</li> <li>• One response sought that all the noise provisions be retained as they are.</li> <li>• One response sought a number of changes to the objectives, policies and rules with respect to night time port activities, measurement of noise and provision for emergency generators.</li> </ul>
<b>Residential zones</b>	<b>General residential zone</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twenty responses received from a range of different parties, with a number in support of the proposed zone.</li> <li>• A large number of the feedback seeks changes, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ zoning changes,</li> <li>○ greater consistency between the two residential zones,</li> <li>○ increases/changes to various building control standards (i.e height, coverage, density, partitioning of houses),</li> <li>○ protection from effects of increased density,</li> <li>○ clarity of the difference between a residential unit and minor residential unit,</li> <li>○ options for developing /intensification on hillsides,</li> <li>○ provision for climate change and/or green rated/sustainable house designs,</li> <li>○ requirements to provide for cycle parking,</li> <li>○ provision for retirement villages,</li> <li>○ greater flexibility for bnb accommodation and more control over Airbnb's, and</li> <li>○ other minor rule changes.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Topic		Summary of feedback
	<b>Medium density residential zone</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forty-five responses received, majority of which are from Nelson residents.</li> <li>• Equal amount of support and opposition for the proposed zone has been received.</li> <li>• General support for intensification has been received from a large number of responses.</li> <li>• Some responses indicate that the zone could go further to provide for intensification.</li> <li>• Opposition to the zoning relates to concerns about traffic congestion/safety, impact on existing character, and impacts on neighbouring properties from the proposed building control standards (e.g shading effects).</li> <li>• Numerous feedback seeks review of various building control standards (i.e height, coverage, density, recession planes, and yard setbacks) to both increase and decrease the proposed standards.</li> <li>• A number of feedback responses seek rezoning to exclude specific streets from the zone (e.g Exeter Street, Domett Street, and Nile/Hardy Streets).</li> <li>• A number of responses seek changes to the provisions for Fairfield Park/behind the Cathedral area of the zone, generally to retain the character of the area. Changes sought in particular relate to density and height controls.</li> <li>• A number of feedback responses seeks extension of the zone to other areas.</li> <li>• Recognition for retirement villages within the zone is sought.</li> <li>• Kāinga Ora has provided extensive feedback, generally in support, and considers that the Nelson Plan is moving towards alignment with the National Policy Statement – Urban Development (NPSUD). Greater alignment is sought in terms of intensification enabled in centres, corridors and associated walkable catchments. Extension of the zone boundary is sought in various locations. Amendment is sought to ensure provisions relating to amenity reflect direction of NPS-UD.</li> <li>• NMDHB provided detailed feedback with overall support and seeks a number of amendments, in particular in relation to incorporating universal design standards within a certain proportion of multi-unit development.</li> <li>• Waka Kotahi – NZTA provided detailed feedback, generally in support.</li> </ul>
	<b>Wakefield Quay</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four responses received.</li> </ul>

Topic		Summary of feedback
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two responses seek reinstatement of provisions relating to new structures on the sea edge into the Design guide for Wakefield Quay.</li> <li>• One supports the overall intention of the Design guide and seeks recognition of sea level rise and extreme weather events.</li> </ul>
<b>Rural zones</b>	<b>General rural zone</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twelve responses, six which seek zone changes.</li> <li>• Others seek specific (minor) changes to the provisions.</li> <li>• One favours protecting indigenous vegetation throughout the rural zone (not only in SNAs).</li> </ul>
	<b>Rural lifestyle zone</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twelve responses received, eight concern potential zone changes.</li> <li>• One favours protecting indigenous vegetation throughout the zone (not only in SNAs).</li> <li>• One seeks specific amendments relating to the management of plantation forestry.</li> <li>• One seeks a greater level of residential development in the Rural lifestyle zone.</li> </ul>
<b>Signs</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three responses received, all of which seek minor amendments and corrections to the rules.</li> </ul>
<b>Subdivision</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twelve responses received.</li> <li>• Specific feedback seeks more opportunity for rural lifestyle subdivision in Nelson North.</li> <li>• The cumulative effect of rural subdivision on State Highways is raised by Waka Kotahi - NZTA.</li> <li>• Greater resource and energy efficiency through subdivision design is sought.</li> <li>• Design to reduce adverse landscape and sedimentation effects, and maintenance of urban green space/open space has been noted.</li> <li>• Specific references to the Nelson Tasman Land Development Manual standards (as activity conditions in rules) is raised.</li> </ul>



Topic	Summary of feedback
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opposition to the 200m<sup>2</sup> minimum allotment size in the Medium density zone.</li> <li>• Reference has been made to access connectivity and active transport through subdivision design.</li> <li>• Support for the Future Development Strategy has been also received.</li> </ul>
<b>Temporary activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three responses received, with one supporting the proposed provisions.</li> <li>• Waka Kotahi - NZTA also supports the provisions, with some minor amendment to require regard be given to public transport and active modes when managing effects of temporary activities.</li> <li>• A forestry company seeks recognition of reverse sensitivity effects of temporary activities.</li> </ul>
<b>General/Other</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thirty general comments have been received.</li> <li>• Many of the general points are not within the remit of the Draft Nelson Plan.</li> <li>• Number of comments received regarding the size, layout and accessibility to the public, including for those with disabilities or language barriers, of the Nelson Plan document.</li> <li>• General comments that the Draft Nelson Plan doesn't go far enough with respect to addressing impacts of Climate change, improving affordable housing and solving transport issues.</li> </ul>