

Tabled 14/4/2023
Nick Urwin

358 Cambridge Ice
Lower than.

Proposed District Plan Change 56.
A Supporting Submission.

I apologise for not attending the
Submitter Briefing Session as I was
sick up following a Medical event.

Had I attended I would have looked to
the land explaining the matter of Conflict
of Interest as it relates to Council
involvement.

Briefly, the Council has been involved in
the publication and I assume the preparation
of the Proposed District Plan Change A.

A Council Officer Report on the Plan Change
has been prepared.

And at the conclusion of the hearings
Council Officers have a Right of Reply.

I assume they will make comments
in relation to matters raised not only
during the hearing but also in relation
to the written submissions.

All this is very well and in general
would be acceptable. However, I believe
that any matters raised by Council or
its officers should be subjected to the
same criteria afforded anyone with a
"Conflict of Interest"
i.e. they should be disregarded!

The reasoning for this view, which I believe would be shared by other Submitters is that in the case of the Hill City Council the Council has a "Conflict of Interest" as it has a vested interest in the outcome of any District Plan Changes as the Council itself is a Property Developer and owner of Urban Plus a Development and Property ownership enterprise wholly owned and controlled by Council.

Council Officers will be aware of this and as such their reports and comments could well be seen as tainted.

So much for transparency and fairness. I hope that the Panel will follow this up as it is or could have an impact on what is being reported on. At the same time I hope that the Media will take this matter up as well and make it well known to the Public in general.

Moving on I do not believe that there are many people who are opposed to intensification in general, however I believe that what the Public is opposed to is the "Stupidity" which apparently has been associated with developments which have involved intensification up to now.

Stupidity, in relation to the Provision of Sufficient of Street

5
Parking particularly as it affects
Traffic Flow and existing other Residents
and Visitor Parking.

Sladden Street in Nae Nae with its
additional Bus Service is a typical
example. Aiki Street development
currently being completed is another.

These are narrow Streets that cannot
cope with the additional On-Street Parking.
In turn this creates a "Nuisance"
and does not provide existing residents
with their parking and access entitlements.
"Nuisance" creating can be legally
challenged!

Additionally there has to be an
element of "Stupidity" associated with
the proposed new up to 6 floor provisions
which will without appropriate Building
Conditions deprive next door Residents
to Sun Light, Air flow and appropriate
healthy living conditions.

It would appear from my reading of
the proposals that multi stories could
be built within metres of each other.

Take a look at the Multi Apartments
being developed on Cambridge Tce at
Epani Station!

While Apartment living in full high
rise areas in those areas that still have
low rise neighbours - this type of development

Can again be regarded as a "nuisance" 4
While on the matter of proposed high
rise development it is my understanding
that there is a lack of Fire Sprinkler
facilities in most if not all the Apartment
Blocks of 6 or more Units in Buildings of
2 Floors or more.

I understand that this is a Fire
Service requirement obviously put in place
for the safety of residents.

What has been going on and why
are the provisions not being complied with.
Is it a matter of cost??

I also believe that there is an element
of Stodidity or negligence associated with
the lack of the required Permeate needs which
I understand is 30% of a development site
and acts to avoid excessive water and
ponding but allowing for natural
drainage.

While these matters have in part
been covered in my written submission
I have clarified them here and confirm
that any matters of objection to
Intensification could simply be covered
by making any proposed Developments
subject to Approved Plans & Appropriate
Building Consents issued by Councils.

In Conclusion I re-iterate that I ⁵
have serious concerns in relation to the
actual or perceived conflict of interest
in relation to the Council's involvement
in promoting the District Plan changes!

Nick Ursin
Submitter & Resident

28 March '23

cc. The Editor.
The Dominion Post.

SLADDON STREET - MAENAS



?? RESIDENT PARKING & BUS
ACCESS .

BLADDEN STREET, NAENAE,



PARKING + BUS TRAVEL PROBLEMS



HAMPSON COURT - BRUNN DEVELOPMENTS.



WHERE ARE THE HEALTH + SAFETY
SPRINKLER PROVISIONS?



SPRINKLER PROVISIONS? +
38% PERMEATE?

COLELAND STREET RESERVE DRV.
URBAN PLUS!



22 30% PERMEATE PROVISIONS/
REQUIREMENTS.