

	Submitter	Support/Oppose	Key points	To be heard
1.	Lynette Schott	Oppose in full	Not opposed to a development but has to be reasonable in relation to surrounding property. Inadequate parking for a multi-story development Suggests amend to 4-dwellings, enable more parking to reduce impacts	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	Jane Nelson	Oppose in full	Proposal creates significant shading on neighbouring property. Proposal should be amended to comply with the district plan standards <u>Additional submission</u> Opposed the application in entirety. Proposal will generate an unacceptable level of environmental effects that cannot be avoided or mitigated. Most significant environmental effects are associated with the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amenity - Shading - Beach in maximum building height - Inappropriate density - Exceedance in site coverage - Insufficient parking Submitter intends to elaborate further at a hearing. Proposal is contrary to most relevant objective and policies of the KDP which should carry a greater degree of weighting when determining the outcome of the application. The application does not represent an acceptable outcome or promote sustainable management of natural and physical resource (part 2 of the RMA) Withhold the option of revising opinion, if the applicant produces a revised set of plans which demonstrate a much higher degree of compliance with the district plan standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3.	Jan Harnett (via Ayson Surveyors)	Oppose in full	Concerns relating to the effect of the non-compliances on adjoining properties, including flow on effects of insufficient parking and manoeuvring area, as well as concerns of setting a precedent with breaching the maximum height and the effects it might have on views. Suggests, reduce number of units and encroachment of height Engage traffic engineer to assess traffic movement issues and parking	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4.	Janice Atkinson	Oppose in full	There is no good reason to [grant] consent for this many breaches. Esplanade environment needs to be protected. There be effects with insufficient on-site parking and will adversely affect future development. The application be declined or proposal amends the height, number of units, require no less than 2 parks per unit & no less than 1 visitor park per unit	<input type="checkbox"/>
5.	Bruce Thomson	Oppose in full	"Keep as is" Should be more parking available. Likely that the provided parking will be used for "toys". More parking needs to be provided.	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Submitter	Support/Oppose	Key points	To be heard
			The esplanade is Kaikoura's jewel in the crown and does not need this type of development – there is sufficient land available elsewhere.	
6.	Judith Erren (109 Torquay St)	Oppose in full	Significantly exceeds the height limits which will negatively affect existing views to mountains and sea as well as shading on neighbouring properties. Exceeds a number of standards, height in relation to boundary, density, lack of parking spaces leading to potentially dangerous traffic conditions. The proposal is better suited for the commercial zone. The application should be declined.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7.	Levi Grady	Oppose in full	The proposal is undermining residential zoning protections and threatening character, privacy and amenity of the area. Allowing overdevelopment sets a dangerous precedent for future zoning violations and jeopardizes long-term integrity of Kaikōura residential neighbourhoods. It will create issues for the surrounding environment, with overshadowing neighbouring, privacy, etc. There are other areas better suited for this development.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8.	Jacky Gray	Oppose in full	There should be no more than 4 apartments built. If Council allows a breach of the zoning standards this will set a precedent for the future, providing no protection for existing property owners. Request that the proposal be amended from 9 units to 4. The proposal shall be amended to meet the current requirements. Otherwise a precedent is being set. Non-compliance with the building height will negatively impact the neighbouring properties with loss of sun, privacy, also affects on noise, traffic, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>
9.	Richard Grady Susan Grady	Oppose in full	Application does not allow for sufficient off-road parking, there should be no more than 4 units and none of them should be over 5.5m. Increase off road parking to include 3 car garaging and 2 visitor parks as a minimum for each unit to protect/mitigate environmental effects.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10.	William Foresman	Oppose in full	This exceeds residential building codes for the area. If approved it is commercialisation by stealth. Do we want the esplanade to look like the wolfbrook development? Adhere to Council building code and people's wishes that actually live here.	<input type="checkbox"/>
11.	Holly Harris Johnny Clark	Oppose in full	Application is in breach of existing performance standards in the district plan. Application does not allow for sufficient off-road parking on-site. The maximum number of apartments developed on site should be 4 to comply with standards. It creates shading on the neighbouring properties. We don't want Kaikoura to lose its small town charm. Increase off-road parking requirements to include 3 car garaging and 2 visitor car parks as a minimum for each residential unit to mitigate environmental effects. The proposal should be amended to comply with the district plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Submitter	Support/Oppose	Key points	To be heard
12.	Susan Ruscigno	Oppose in full	Residents surrounding the area of this submission, made it clear that we oppose the commercialisation of the block ending at Ramsgate St. The Council removed this proposal [the spatial plan]. This proposal is exactly what was opposed. Approving this application would start a slippery slope of development along this block and blatantly reveal the Council to be acting in bad faith (developers “develop” for financial gain, who else would these units benefit? Tourists, investors, short term renters) Stick to existing building regulations (height, density, parking) for this area. If the developer chooses not to amend their building design/plan, suggest commercial areas in town that are available and more suited to this enterprise.	<input type="checkbox"/>
13.	Jill Carpinter	Oppose in full	Proposal is in breach of existing standards and creates shading on the pensioner’s [the submitter’s residence]. The proposal should be reduced to comply with district plan standards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
14.	Moritz Wagner	Oppose in full	The proposal exceeds height, height in relation to boundary, density standards and lacks required parking spaces. Development appears to be a commercial project and therefore does not fit into the residential area of Kaikōura. Nothing in the plans justify granting exemptions from the existing building requirements. Application shall be declined in full and a new application should be submitted consistent with existing rules.	<input type="checkbox"/>
15.	Alanah Conner	Support in full	Project is anticipated to create jobs and hopefully bring visitors impacting [supporting] local businesses. A lot of areas in Kaikōura are at a standstill, empty and sad looking. Kaikōura needs progress to be a viable town. Each apartment includes garages & parking for visitors on the street is a standard arrangement in this area. Replacing the existing structure with a new design will improve aesthetic and functional aspects of the esplanade. I strongly encourage Council to approve.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
16.	Stacey Annett	Support in full	The coastal design is thoughtfully planned and integrates well with the Esplanade. The concerns raised in the public notification are minor. It is clear that the efforts have been made to minimise shading by placing the driveway to the left of the site between the development and adjacent property. Shading will still occur at height of 5.5m but existing dwelling exceeds this. Each apartment includes garage alleviating parking concerns while visitor parking will be on the street. This is typical for many properties. Site coverage is minimal and poses no issues. Site currently has 10 units, exceeding district square metres. Replacing dilapidated earthquake damaged complex which detracts from esplanades appeal, with 9 new architecturally designed apartments is an obvious choice.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
17.	Brad & Jo Murray	Oppose in full	Maximum building height should be 5.5m as required. Application doesn’t allow for sufficient off-road parking on site which will affect the esplanade. Site is in a residential zone with a max. number of apartments should be 4. Plan creates significant shading of submitters property and neighbour’s property. In our view the application of breach existing performance standards in the KDP. Change the number of apartments to 4, height to 5.5m and meet off-road parking for 2 car garage and space for boats, trailers and visitor carparking as a min for each apartment	<input type="checkbox"/>

