

Nelson Urban Growth Strategy 2004

Analysis of Submissions

Status: Final
Prepared by: NCC Environmental Policy Department, June 2005
Contact: Tony Quickfall, Manager Environmental Policy, 546-0431

Part A - Overview	3
Part B – Responses to Specific Questions	5
Growth options.....	5
Intensification	5
Grow out (greenfields)	6
Industrial land.....	7
Commercial.....	9
Other areas of concern	10
Part C – Demographic information.....	11

Part A - Overview

1. Overall summary of community expectations

A total of 907 submissions were received. Due to the nature of the survey questions, submitters may have responded more than once to the same questions, which means there are more than 907 responses to some questions.

Overall, there was very strong support for a planned, strategic approach to growth. No submitters were advocating growth. While some advocated no growth or slow growth, by far the clear majority of submitters wanted controlled growth.

An overall summary with clear emerging themes is summarised as follows:

a) Residential

Intensification

- Strong majority preference for low rise intensification at nodes rather than greenfields¹, or intensification before greenfields.
- Preferred density between 300m² and 500m².
- This was qualified support by many submitters, with emphasis on ensuring quality design (no boxes, 3 stories maximum, and affordable), no gated communities, good access / proximity to services, and adherence to urban design principles (walkability, transport efficient, energy efficient) to promote strong communities and “urban villages”.

Greenfields¹

- Preferred greenfields development options in priority order, taking into account opposition:

Favoured	Neutral	Opposed (strongly)
1. Ngawhatu (option B) and Atawhai to Todds Valley (E) - equal	Hira (f) - approximately equal for and against	1. The Glen (F)
2. South Nelson (A)		2. Maitai (D)
3. The Brook (C)		

- Submitters generally favoured tighter controls to ensure their preferences were implemented.
- Mixed densities preferred, with clusters and retaining rural character.
- Strong support to protect productive land.

b) Industrial

Favoured (strongly)

- No heavy industry in Nelson urban area

¹ “Greenfields” refers to previously undeveloped land, usually rural.

- Continuing to provide for light or service industry given its economic importance
- Intensify existing industrial areas first (Annesbrook, Tahuna, Saxton, Port)
- No more industrial land should be provided in Nelson
- Coordinate industrial growth with TDC taking a regional approach and promoting industrial parks (very strong support)
- Tighter planning controls
- Promoting high tech industry

Neutral (both for and against approximately equal)

- Rezone Wakapuaka flats for industrial / aquaculture
- Rezone Hira for Industrial

Opposed (strongly)

- Rezoning of The Glen for industrial
- Heavy industry in Nelson

c) Commercial

Favoured

- Intensify existing commercial/retail land
- Boutique retailing in Nelson (strong support)
- Local retail areas in suburbs - villages (strong support)
- Commercial area at Hira
- Tighten controls, particularly building design
- Coordinate with TDC

Oppose

- Big box retailing

d) Other Significant Issues

Transport²

- Promoting and integrating public transport oriented development
- Integrating transport with land use planning
- Parking

Landscape

- Mixed response to development on the hills, both for and against
- Landscape was identified as important, but not a barrier to development
- Submitters generally favoured sensitive hill development (and clustering) rather than no hill development
- Atawhai hills (Walters Bluff to Todds Valley) were an area particularly favoured for further sensitive development rather than landscape protection

Architecture and design

- Tighter design controls (especially commercial)

² Note – many of the transport issues relating to NUGS will be considered as part of Transit New Zealand's Brightwater to Hira corridor study.

Part B – Responses to Specific Questions

Notes:

1. Percentages shown are the percentage of all responses to that particular question, not percentage of all submissions.
2. Due to the very wide variance in “other comments”, all comments which do not relate to a specific question have been analysed based on key emerging themes, rather than numbers or percentages. In many cases, comments included multiple suggestions: in others, it was not clear what the submitter was suggesting, or it wasn’t relevant to NUGS.

Growth options

- a) *Grow in, grow out, or do nothing*³ (896 responses)
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| Grow within urban areas | 54% |
| Grow out | 40% |
| Do nothing | 6% |

Intensification

- b) *Intensification – what type of intensification* (1093 responses)
- | | |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Low rise attached housing | 30% |
| Higher density | 28% |
| Granny flats | 18% |
| High rises | 10% |
| Gated communities | 5% |
| Other | 9% |
- c) *Where should intensification occur* (1596 responses)
- | | |
|-----------|-----|
| Wood | 22% |
| Stoke | 20% |
| Atawhai | 18% |
| Hospital | 18% |
| Tahunanui | 17% |
| Other | 6% |

“Other” key comments:

- Anywhere in the urban area
- Mix of all areas
- Richmond
- Valleys
- Hills
- Hira
- Central city
- Preserve open spaces
- Consider transport routes

- d) *How dense should intensification be?* (488 responses)
- | | |
|----------------------------|----|
| Low (>1000m ²) | 5% |
|----------------------------|----|

³ Note that “no growth” was not provided as an option. “No growth” responses are recorded in (o), other issues.

Medium low	7%
Medium (500m ²)	36%
Medium high	38%
High (<300m ²)	16%

- e) *How strongly do you feel about intensification?*
- | | |
|---------------|-----|
| Not very | 1% |
| Fairly | 2% |
| Average | 17% |
| Strongly | 40% |
| Very strongly | 41% |
- f) *Key emerging themes from the intensification comments*
- Promote integrated, planned walkable villages
 - Mix of all types and densities
 - Gated communities specifically opposed
 - Plan for affordable housing
 - No intensification of Maitai, Glen, Hira
 - Improve building design
 - Intensify first before greenfields development
 - Contain within urban area – no greenfields
 - Improve transport networks
 - Plan for aging population
 - Plan for peak oil
 - Retain open space
 - Low rise – 3 stories max in suburban areas

Grow out (greenfields)

- g) *Where should Nelson grow out? (1422 responses in support of growing out)*
- | | |
|---------------------------------|-----|
| Option A – South Nelson | 13% |
| Option B – Ngawhatu/stoke hills | 20% |
| Option C – The Brook | 12% |
| Option D – Maitai Valley | 9% |
| Option E – Atawhai | 20% |
| Option F – Hira/The Glen | 13% |
| Other | 14% |

Key emerging themes from the comments

Areas where growth was opposed

- Option A (South Nelson) – very minor opposition
- Option D (Maitai) – very strong opposition (as residential)
- Option F (Hira township) - mixed support and opposition
- Option F (Glen) – strong opposition
- Option F (State Highway 6 Glen turn off; Lud Vly; Teal Vly; Cable Bay Rd: expansion of Rural Small Holdings) – neutral, no clear support or opposition but retain rural character
- Some opposition to greenfields growth anywhere
- Areas of productive farmland – strong opposition to development of productive land

Other areas suggested for growth

- Richmond/TDC – moderate support
- Atawhai - strong support
- Hills – strong support for hill development (minor opposition)
- Delaware Bay
- Cable Bay and Cable Bay farm
- Some support for growth anywhere
- Todds valley – mixed support and opposition, no emerging preference
- Close to city – strong support
- No growth – minor support for no growth

h) For greenfields residential, how dense should housing be? (414 responses)

Low (>1000m2)	19%
Medium low	19%
Medium (500m2)	43%
Medium high	14%
High (<300m2)	5%

i) For greenfields rural, how dense should housing be?

Low (>2ha)	28%
Medium low	14%
Medium (1ha)	25%
Medium high	18%
High (<500m2)	15%

Key emerging themes from comments

- Strong support for mix of densities and section sizes
- Strong support for housing clusters and villages
- Strong support for maintaining rural character

j) How strongly do you feel about greenfields density?

Not very	1%
Fairly	2%
Average	19%
Strongly	35%
Very strongly	43%

Industrial land

k) Should NCC provide more industrial land? (577 responses)

		Agree	How strongly do you feel about this?				
			Not very	Fairly	Average	Strongly	Very Strongly
Provide more land		51%	2%	6%	29%	34%	29%
<i>type</i>	<i>Heavy</i>	29%					
	<i>Light</i>	71%					
No more land & tighten controls		35%	1%	2%	9%	39%	49%
Do nothing		14%	6%	6%	19%	14%	55%

l) *How /where should NCC provide for industrial land? (690 responses)*

Option H1 – Vanguard St	20%
Option H2 – Intensify Tahunanui	19%
Option H3 – Coordinate with TDC	47%
Option H4 – Other	14%

Other areas suggested

- Annesbrook
- Haven (reclaim)
- Hira/Nelson North (balance both for and against)
- Honda site
- Nelson Valleys
- Port
- Richmond (industrial area)
- Airport
- Stoke
- Tasman District
- The Glen (for and against, more against)
- Wakapuaka Flats (balance both for and against)
- Freezing works

m) *Key emerging themes from industrial comments*

Very strong support

- Coordinate with TDC on a regional approach
- Tighten controls
- Heavy industry should be outside urban areas
- Light industry only in urban areas

Strong support

- Provide better buffers around industrial areas
- Economic importance of industry should be recognised (strong support)
- Intensify existing areas (strong support)

Other themes

- Contain existing industrial areas
- Co-locate similar industries
- Provide industrial parks
- Encourage high tech industries
- Relocate/reduce car yards
- Some opposition to Vanguard St (option H1)

Commercial

n) *Should NCC provide more commercial land? (570 responses)*

	Agree	How strongly do you feel about this?				
		Not very	Fairly	Average	Strongly	Very Strongly
Provide more land	42%	2%	6%	29%	34%	29%
Provide no more land & tighten up	35%	1%	2%	9%	39%	49%
Do nothing	22%	6%	6%	19%	14%	55%

o) *Where should more commercial land be provided? (826 responses)*

Nelson City	23%
Richmond	20%
Stoke	19%
Tahunanui	18%
Atawhai	9%
Other	11%

Other areas suggested for commercial/retail

- Hira (22 in favour, 5 opposed)
- Central city
- Intensify existing areas and/or contain existing areas (strong support)
- Local service centres (villages - very strongly supported)
- Stoke
- Tahunanui
- Atawhai
- Richmond big box, Nelson boutique
- Honda site (6 in favour, 2 opposed)
- Trafalgar Park (8 in favour)

p) *Retail type?(533 responses)*

	Provide more	Tighten up
Big box/superstores	39%	91%
Standard/local/boutique	61%	9%

q) *Additional commercial / retail comments*

- Big box retail was opposed in the submitter comments (70 opposed, 22 in favour)
- Strong support for boutique / local retail
- Strong support for tighter controls, particularly design controls
- Some support for mixed retail (bulk and boutique)
- Some submitters opposed to car yards
- Minor support for malls (5)
- TDC/NCC coordination of bulk retail (big box) commercial activities

Other areas of concern

r) Are there any other areas of concern? (178 responses)

Issue	Responses	Details
transport ⁴ (including peak oil)	19%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New routes • Better (integrated) planning • Improved public transport
no growth / stop growth	10%	
walking / cycling	7%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote and enhance walking/cycling
design / architecture	6%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve building design • Better provision for good urban design principles
parks / reserves	5%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote and enhance open spaces
other growth or no growth areas not identified	4%	
community facilities	1%	
air quality	1%	
changing demographics	1%	
other (general, wide range not related to NUGS)	47%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Slow growth • Collaborate with TDC • Natural hazards (sea level)

⁴ Note –there is a major strategic corridor study currently underway by Transit New Zealand which will consider and address many of the comments relating to transport, including parking, more routes, and traffic demand management

Part C – Demographic Information

<i>a) Age of respondents (753 responses)</i>		
up to 15 years		1%
16-35		11%
35-60		62%
60 of older		27%
 <i>b) Length of time in Nelson/Tasman</i>		
<12 months		1%
12 months – 2 years		4%
2-5 yrs		10%
5-10 yrs		13%
10-20 yrs		22%
20 yrs or more		50%
 <i>c) Nationality (651 respondents)</i>		
	number	%
New Zealander	539	83%
Maori	9	1%
Asian	1	
North American	14	2%
UK	41	6%
Australian	8	1%
Pacific Islander	2	
Other	3	
 <i>d) Housing situation</i>		
Couple w/o children		38%
Couple with children		34%
Living alone		18%
Single parent		6%
Flatting		4%