

7 July 2022

RE: MAITAI private Plan Change 28 for NCC.

1 | BACKGROUND

Kia ora koutou and good afternoon everyone.

Firstly, thank you to the RMA commissioners for their time and patients to hear all the various opinions on these important matters.

My name is Mathew Hay I am co Director of Fineline Architecture. I have lived in Nelson for over 15 years and have been participating in the architectural field during these years and for some time before this in Auckland and Wellington.

My initial response to the plans to build 550 new houses in the Maitai Valley is problematic for I do understand the housing shortage and housing affordability issues that we face in our community as well as the shortage of diverse quality hosing types. In the main my problem is with the type of development that is being proposed. My interest in housing from a professional point of view to ensure that we are building the houses today that are specific to the needs of our communities for the coming 50 years and are not a repetition of the building types that we have rolled out for the last 50 years. We face the challenges of decarbonising our economy and building has the two-fold issues involved that include embodied caron and operational carbon. Both need to be reduced significantly if we want to start combating the negative effects of climate change. There are the obvious negative environmental affects of building new housing developments in the Maitai Valley that include disruption of a valuable recreational area close to the city and the uninterrupted green corridor stretching from the city to Pelorus. This type of green space would be the envy of other similar sized cities around the world. The stormwater runoff into the Maitai river from both housing and increased road traffic would jeopardise the ability to safely swim in this river, an activity that has been enjoyed for generations. All these things other people have spoken to, and I agree with them wholeheartedly and these reasons to me would justify not approving the proposed plan change.

However, it is the type of development that is proposed in the area that I want to speak to and the possibility of doing development better in our region that I would see as the key message I would like to deliver.

2 | COMMUNITY FOCUSED SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENTS

The private developer led proposal is in the main single house lots on individual green field sites. This type of development is the most carbon hungry and most cost in-efficient type of development that we have come up with to date. The level of individual infrastructure required to service this type of development is significant and much of this infrastructure cost is borne by the community rather than the developer. I also believe pursuing development following the 20-minute city philosophy in which all development should be focused on new housing being within 20 minutes of walking or cycling to all the amenities people would need including schools, shopping and work. This leads to a pedestrian and cycling culture being developed all of the ecological, health and economic benefits that this entails. The development as proposed within





the plan change 28 will lead to a community that is dependant on vehicular access to amenities and all of the negative ecological, health and economic damage that that will do.

3 | BENCHMARCKS FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

If development was to take place in a successful plan change 28 then a very high bar on the type of sustainable development required would be essential. This should include benchmarked and measurable standards. There are many measurable standards in this area. I would advise council to look to Passive House standards on insulation levels and operation energy maximums as a way of ensuring that the development is established to have a net benefit on the Nelson community and physical environment. We would like all new building work be established with an eye to what the world will be like in the next 40 to 50 years and beyond. The notion that the land involved will be developed merely to meet the building code would be very problematic as this is a minimum standard and as things stand is a business-as-usual model. Anyone who has investigated and taken seriously the notion of the climate change emergency can see that business as usual is not a viable option for us.

4 | INTENSIFICATION- no more single unit green field development. NT Future Development Strategy and NT2050 Urban Development Agency.

The potential of the development to occur in the single unit green field development model of lower Queen St in Richmond is very problematic in my professional opinion. If development was allowed under plan change 28 the only rational way to develop would be through a community focused sustainable and intensive way. The NTFDS led people to believe that there was a desire for intensification in the Nelson Tasman Region and the majority of public submissions in this regard advocated for intensification to lead any new development in the region. Guiding principles for development could look to independent groups such as NT2050 on how to develop in net positive ways. The possibility to establish and independent 'Urban Design Agency' to lead and ensure that quality development occurs would further guarantee that the plan change and the associated negative environmental impact on the local green recreational area close to town would be done in a way that would best benefit and enhance our community.

4 | CONCLUSIONS

The land in question is too valuable to be developed in a profit hungry single unit green field business as usual way. Our people deserve more from the design profession and the construction industry and the people in the position to affect and ensure that this happens lie in your hands. Let us act as good ancestors in this matter and leave the place we live in a better way than it was when we first came here. Thank you for you time today and feel free to be in touch if you have any questions.

Nga Mihi Mathew Hay Barch BAS LBP 021 563 021 mathew@finelinearchitecture.co.nz