<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub No.</th>
<th>Specific Provision</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Decision Requested</th>
<th>Wish to be heard</th>
<th>Further Submissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole of PC56</td>
<td>Submitter supports tightening of the rules and agrees with the proposals in PC56. Of particular concern is that infill housing should not block sunshine or main view of adjoining neighbours. The submitters consider that infill housing in the outer suburbs should only be permitted if it is at least 2m from all boundaries and building in a style to blend with surrounding homes, is restricted to one storey (unless all other houses are two storey) and where land levels are raised, that solid retaining walls and adequate draining is required.</td>
<td>To approve the plan change as proposed. Note concerns about building infill housing closer than 2m to boundaries and requirement for adequate retaining walls and drainage.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole of PC56</td>
<td>The submitter holds several concerns with proposed Plan Change 56 as it will give the Council more rules and regulations with which to unfairly burden those who have bought property with the intention of being able to build additional structures on it. The submitter supports the current rules in the Plan and states that if you want to change those rules then it should only apply to property purchased after the notification of the Plan Change. The submitter believes there are sufficient existing regulations, which if used properly, would stop many of the ugly examples of high density infill (eg. streetscape, height, planes, 35% site coverage).</td>
<td>Seeks that the Council stay with the current status quo and enforce existing rules and regulations properly.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole of PC56</td>
<td>The submitter supports the whole Plan Change as he considers that the current provisions are far too liberal and do not give adequate protection for neighbours views, light etc. The new provisions will greatly improve the situation and provide a much fairer deal for neighbours.</td>
<td>Approve the Proposed District Plan Change.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole of PC56</td>
<td>The submitter supports the plan change in its entirety as it is concerned at the inevitable cumulative effects of infill development on the amenity and character of Ngaio. The submitter has particular concerns about the height of recent new (and proposed) infill development. In the hilly suburb it allows designers to excavate and create structures up to 4 stories high, completely out of scale with the residential context. Approval is also given for the desire to minimise hard paved areas and promote on-site drainage. Approval is given to section 3.2.3.8 (requirements for a site development plan – subdivision), Policies 4.2.2.1A and 4.2.2.1B and the Residential and Subdivision Design Guides. Approval is given to Policies 4.2.3.1A – 4.2.3.1C, 4.2.33, 4.2.4.1A and rules 5.1.1.2, 5.1.3.2, 5.1.3.2B, 5.1.3.4.3, 5.3.1.6, 5.3.1.11, 5.3.3.3, 5.4.5.2A, 5.4.5.2B.</td>
<td>Adopt the plan change in its entirety.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whole of</td>
<td>The submitter supports the Plan Change, particularly the new residential policies, as they relate well to Policy 8 of the Regional Policy Statement (RPS) which identifies good urban design and protection of amenity values as key elements in achieving environmental quality in urban areas. The open space provisions, the height restriction for 2nd units on a site, and the stronger policy approach to encourage the retention of mature trees and bush and minimises hard surfaces are consistent with Policies (1) and (2) of the RPS. The submitter supports the use of the Residential and Subdivision Design Guides (in particular the new section on Individual Lot Design) to manage the effects of infill housing. In respect of the Subdivision Design Guide, the guidance to incorporate on-site water quality treatments measures is also supported.</td>
<td>That the Council adopt Plan Change 56.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Whole of</td>
<td>The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.</td>
<td>That the Council approve PC 56 for inclusion in the District Plan, but specifically notes a number of suggested amendments.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Whole of</td>
<td>The submitter outlines a number of significant concerns with the plan change. The submitter seeks the abandonment of PC 56 on that basis that it is poorly conceived and contains unworkable provisions.</td>
<td>That plan change 56 not be approved.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Whole of</td>
<td>The submitter cites numerous concerns about the Plan Change and opposes it in its entirety. Specific provisions outlined elsewhere.</td>
<td>That the Plan Change is revoked in its entirety and that Council embark on comprehensive consultation with the public and building industry rather than pass its legislation down in such a draconian manner.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Whole of</td>
<td>The submitter opposes the following provision as they are far too restrictive and onerous.</td>
<td>That the plan change be withdrawn in its entirety.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Whole of</td>
<td>The submitter opposes the whole plan change in its entirety, noting that the changes proposed have significantly restricted the ability for the efficient use and development of land to occur and the policies now send mixed messages (eg. policies under 4.2.2, 4.2.3 and 4.2.4).</td>
<td>That the plan change be withdrawn in its entirety.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Whole of</td>
<td>The submitter opposes the whole plan change in its entirety, noting that the changes proposed have significantly restricted the ability for the efficient use and development of land to occur and the policies now send mixed messages (eg. policies under 4.2.2, 4.2.3 and 4.2.4).</td>
<td>That the plan change be withdrawn in its entirety.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Whole of</td>
<td>Supports the Plan Change, considering the aim to increase the quality of infill and multi-unit housing developments is important to the continuing development of Wellington as a city.</td>
<td>That the Committee note the support and address the amendments sought above.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Action Recommended</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Whole of PC56</td>
<td>The submitter considers the plan change over reaches to such an extent that the changes will curtail infill housing to a degree that would be inconsistent with the Plan's objectives to retain a compact city. The rules as currently drafted are likely to be more detrimental to suburbs than beneficial as suburbs that attract development and renewal invariably benefit from it. The submitter has particular concerns about the need to focus more tightly on controlling 'externalities' that arise from infill housing and to focus less on internal amenity values. The submitter notes support for the need to have flexibility in administration of the rules (ie. council discretion), but notes the importance of ensuring that there is clarity of purpose in the rules. Processes should be improved to support this discretion (including effective pre-application meetings, site visits at pre-application stage, review of decisions, timeframes for dealing with the consent). The submitter also notes that the Council should be willing to allocate appropriate resource to administration of the new policies and rules rather than requiring the applicant to bear the full cost.</td>
<td>That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 3: Information Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Action Recommended</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.</td>
<td>3.2.2 (subdivision consent information requirements): changes are supported, but doubts the value that having “common furniture items drawn to scale” will have in considering neighbourhood effects.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
<td>Supports a number of these provisions, but also seeks some amendments (wording supplied)</td>
<td>That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.2.3</td>
<td>The submitter outlines a number of significant concerns with the plan change</td>
<td>Section 3.2.3.9: delete first bullet point as it is superfluous and potentially misleading.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.2.3</td>
<td>The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.</td>
<td>Section 3.2.3: the proposed additional items required as part of subdivision consents increase the level of detail needed beyond what should be needed for Council to assess the effects of the proposal. The submitter seeks a number of changes to this section (draft wording supplied).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.2.3</td>
<td>The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.</td>
<td>Section 3.2.3.9: note that the accuracy of aerial photography is generally poor when compared to site survey data. The Council has easy access to this information therefore the time and cost to produce such information compulsorily by applicants seems unnecessary.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.2.4</td>
<td>The submitter is generally in favour of the changes though, as a result, suspects the site coverage will be reduced to 28% and that three levels will become the norm. The submitters also note their belief that the plan change has nothing to do with the quality of housing, rather it is more about amenity.</td>
<td>That the provision requiring furniture items to be drawn to scale on plans stems from concerns about room size. Reintroduce the old NZS 1900 Chp 3 on minimum room sizes, or something suitable to our age.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.2.4</td>
<td>Delete reference to illustration of plans with common furniture items etc.</td>
<td>That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3: Definitions</td>
<td>23 Definitions</td>
<td>The submitter notes that there are a number of issues that have come to light since the Plan was notified that require further clarification. These are mostly minor matters, and as such, may not be picked up by other submitters on the Plan Change.</td>
<td>Site Area Definition and access ways: A refinement to the rule which removes areas used for permanent access from the calculation of site area for unit title, cross lease and company lease subdivisions. This provision should equally apply to situations where only a land use consent is sought in relation to a multi-unit development. Wording suggestions provided.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Definitions</td>
<td>The submitter notes that there are a number of issues that have come to light since the Plan was notified that require further clarification. These are mostly minor matters, and as such, may not be picked up by other submitters on the Plan Change.</td>
<td>Definition of ‘Access Strip’: this revised definition continues to cause confusion due to the double negative used in the second part of the definition. Revised wording is suggested to clarify this.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Definitions</td>
<td>The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.</td>
<td>Definition of ‘site’: should be reviewed as it may enable intense development on small parts of original sites.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Definitions</td>
<td>The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.</td>
<td>3.10 Definitions: changes are supported to give greater clarity</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Definitions</td>
<td>The submitter cites numerous concerns about the Plan Change and opposes it in its entirety, specifically definitions for access strip and site area.</td>
<td>That plan change 56 not be approved.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Definitions</td>
<td>The submitter seeks two changes to PC 56. These include the need to insert a definition for an ‘Infill Household Unit’ and to amend the wording of Proposed Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of a second unit) in order to make it explicitly clear that comprehensive multi-unit housing developments are not subject to rule 5.1.3.4.3.</td>
<td>A definition be included within Chapter 3.10 of the Plan: “Infill Household Unit – means a development within the Outer Residential Area involving the creation of a second and only additional household unit which is outside the footprint of an existing household unit and on a fee simple site of less than 1000m².”</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 Definitions</td>
<td>The submitter seeks two changes to PC 56. These include the need to insert a definition for an ‘Infill Household Unit’ and to amend the wording of Proposed Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of a second unit) in order to make it explicitly clear that comprehensive multi-unit housing developments are not subject to rule 5.1.3.4.3.</td>
<td>Definition of Access Strip: that the status quo remains or at least that the proposed definition needs significant further refinement (note Hearing Committee comments on this issue in Plan Change 6, the effect on the sunlight access plane rules and how access strip will probably be defined to mean all areas of ‘common property’).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 Definitions</td>
<td>The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.</td>
<td>Definition of Site Area: the definition should revert back to its original form as notified in the July 2004 Plan and note that the open space requirement will have a doubling up effect on front lots when the right of way is excluded and open space also required.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 Definitions</td>
<td>The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Definitions</td>
<td>The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council’s discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording. Definition of Site Area: Delete the revised definition as the existing site coverage requirements in combination with the proposed open space provisions are sufficient to ensure adequate open space is provided around infill developments. If the definition is retained, ensure that the right of way is included in the calculation for any lot approved before 5 May 2007.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Definitions</td>
<td>The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council’s discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording. Definition of Access Strip: Delete the revised definition as it will result in ‘amenity areas’ also defined as common property being included in the definition which is not intended.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Definitions</td>
<td>Seeks change to the Defn of “Access Strip” and “Site Area” That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter 4: Residential Areas Objectives and Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined. Section 4.1: supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Add in further sentence and wording to clarify these paragraphs (wording supplied). That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>Supports changes, but seeks one clarification to the phrase “good quality” That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee. Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>Add in additional wording to clarify intent That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56 Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residential Amenity Objectives and Policies (especially policies 4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submitter supports the Plan Change, in particular the ... provision requiring infill housing to be of a similar character to those in the immediate vicinity. The submitter cites concerns about poor quality development in his neighbourhood. That the plan change rules are supported No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submitter supports the restrictions proposed in Plan Change 56 as at the moment too many sections are subdivided and built on behind or in front of existing homes, spoiling character and atmosphere of the street and suburb. The submitter is also concerned that new subdivisions are created and $500,000 homes erected with hardly any garden space in front or behind and with too limited distance between houses. That the council impose restrictions to homeowners, buildings, architects and developers so as to safeguard the traditional setups of a new or existing suburbs. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submitter makes a number of comments regarding infill housing and Council processes, as outlined in the decision requested. Seeks that new houses in established neighbourhoods have to conform with the rest of the street. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submitter fully supports limiting the height of the second unit to single storey... All infill housing is in keeping with the character of surrounding homes and of a similar height Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>That infill housing should be sympathetic to the character of existing and surrounding homes That the Council notes the comments/concerns and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but is concerned it will reduce the potential for sites and create additional uncertainty for potential housing developments and does not provide or promote infill development in appropriate areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but is concerned it will reduce the potential for sites and create additional uncertainty for potential housing developments and does not provide or promote infill development in appropriate areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submitter supports PC 56, in particular the objective to limit the number of houses per site ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submitter strongly supports the following rules and policies: 4.2.2.1A and 4.2.2.1B ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submitter seeks some wording amendments to three parts of the plan change to acknowledge that neighbours, other than immediately adjoining neighbours, can be affected by infill developments and secondly the loss of sound amenity (through increased noise) is also a valid effect that needs consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submitter opposes the following provision as they are far too restrictive and onerous: Reduction in number of units allowed on the site as of right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submitter makes a particular submission about Policy 4.2.2.1B and the associated explanatory text. The submitter supports the provision but holds concerns that the policy may be interpreted to support further infill in areas that have already been subjected to infill. The submitter is keen to ensure that previous infill does not create a presumption that new infill will be approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments. Policies 4.2.2.1A and 4.2.2.1B: The policy should be deleted or rewritten with a change of focus as it is not justified in the context of the reasons for this plan change and it is in conflict with the subdivision policies (4.2.4.1 and 4.2.4.1A). Suggested policy replacement drafted. Also concerned with the comments regarding cumulative effects and the link to 5.3.3.13. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submitter makes a number of comments regarding the issues that derive from infill housing. The submitter states the two primary issues that arise from infill housing include the increased population of an area and the pressures on existing infrastructure, and that new buildings detract from the quality of life and value of nearby properties. The submitter notes that 1. Prominent properties with the potential to significantly block views of others must have restrictions placed on how much view they can block. 2. Older suburban areas with larger properties need to have their specific characters preserved because that is why people move into these areas. 3. It is important to have in place good rules that preserve the value of existing houses and new developments must not be allowed to detract from long established homes. Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording. Policy 4.2.2.1A: should be deleted or at the very least rewritten to reflect the fact that infill housing is a desirable activity which has benefits to the city. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters. Note that while the revised policies do act to strengthen the Plan's objectives, unless there is a significant shift to better recognition of city wide cumulative effects, applications will continue to apply to break the rules rather than strive to meet them. Another approach to managing density could be to create ratios of site coverage to usable open space on a sliding scale. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions. Explanatory text for policies 4.2.2.1 – 4.2.2.1B: clarify how the cumulative effects of very minor breaches to the permitted activity standards is to be judged. Define the length and height of a minor breach for all parties to follow. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions. Policy 4.2.2.1: Clarify whether the intent is to allow two storey's or 9m buildings (which can be 3 stories). The choice of which unit is to be single story should be based on streetscape, topography and site orientation, not on which was built first. Further thought is needed as some areas may change dramatically. Clarify also whether an extra 1m is allowed for pitched roves. May result in tiered developments on sloping sites. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions. Policy 4.2.2.1: There needs to be enough flexibility in the “following of patterns” to allow for good design, ie. it should not enforce a rigid repetition of character of a few existing houses where those houses are not of good design. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>Supports changes, but does seek some further clarification and change to one part of the explanatory statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>Offers several wording amendments to clarify intent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2.2.1 - 4.2.2.1B</td>
<td>Supports new text in paragraph 8 of objective 4.2.2 requiring new development to be consistent with the scale of dwellings in the residential environment. New architecture should be in sympathy with storey height, roof pitch and texture, cladding, window type and fencing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residential Character and Streetscape Objectives and Policies (especially policies 4.2.3.1A - 4.2.3.1C, 4.2.3.3)**

<p>| 33  | 4.2.3 | The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined. | Objective 4.2.3: supported except that it risks generalising outer residential as “more diverse”. | No |
| 70  | 4.2.3 | The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters. | Policy 4.2.3.3: Concerned that commentary in the policies around not applying the permitted baseline to multi-unit developments is inconsistent with the case law. | Yes |
| 84  | 4.2.3 | The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions. | Streetscape: concerned that it's too late now to respect existing designs in most streets. Why pull down new house design to the lowest common denominator. | Yes |
| 44  | 4.2.3 | general support, but there are some elements that require amendments | That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee. | Unknown |
| 9   | 4.2.3.1 | Policy 4.2.3.1 (1st paragraph). Seeks that these provisions are strengthened to keep streetscapes from being changed, this is particularly important where groups of houses were built to a pattern even if they aren't in a designated historic area. | That the Council notes the comments and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision. | No |
| 9   | 4.2.3.1A | The change to require more green space is welcomed as the proliferation of two storied homes on small sections devoid of greenery has not enhanced suburban housing (Policy 4.2.3.1A). | | |
| 29  | 4.2.3.1A | The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but is concerned it will reduce the potential for sites and create additional uncertainty for potential housing developments and does not provided or promote infill development in appropriate areas. | Policy 4.2.3.1A and Rule 5.1.3.2B: use advocacy only regarding open space policy. Amend wording of the policy (draft wording supplied) and delete open space rule. | Yes |
| 33  | 4.2.3.1A | The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined. | Policy 4.2.3.1.A (open space): is too imprecise, provide greater specificity about the nature of those effects. The explanatory text is supported. | No |
| 36  | 4.2.3.1A | The submitter supports PC 56, in particular … Policy 4.2.3.1A and rule 5.1.3.2B (open space) | To make the suggested change to DP 56. | No |
| 65  | 4.2.3.1A | The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted | Policy 4.2.3.1A (para 1) and Rule 5.1.3.2B: Further clarify the intent of the open space rule to match the stated policy in relation to the greenness or otherwise of the open space and whether it can be split into different locations provided the width requirement is maintained. (Suggested wording changes supplied). | Yes |
| 84  | 4.2.3.1A | The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions. | Policy 4.2.1. 4.2.3.1A, Rule 5.1.3.2B: Note the open space can be usable without being on ground level or connected to a living area. Suggest change in size requirement so that 50m² for first unit and then 40m² for subsequent units. Suggest that 4m width minimum be replaced with an area that contains a 4m square box. Allow design flexibility where open space is on a sloping site that may be unusable. Steep sites cannot always have the required outdoor space suggested in the design guide. Why should a reduced outdoor area require neighbours consent? | Yes |
| 47  | 4.2.3.1A | Support the return to an open space requirement. And support G1.2 and G6.2 of the Residential Design Guide. Support ability to mass open spaces into larger common areas. Consider requirement G3.1 (slope of open space areas) to be inappropriate for sloping sites. | Provide alternative guidelines for provision of open space on sloping sites. G3.2: “direct short range overlooking” needs greater definition to be usefully applied. G1.7: note that different patterns of habitation might mean that other times of the day when the ‘principle’ open space receives sun might be more appropriate. | Unknown |
| 44  | 4.2.3.1A | Seek one change to this policy (wording supplied) | That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee. | Unknown |
| 83  | 4.2.3.1A | Reword this policy to remove reference to ‘green open space’ and amend the explanatory text | That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56 | Yes |
| 43  | 4.2.3.1A - 4.2.3.1C | Support for open space, hard surfacing and retention of trees and bush (4.2.3.1A – 4.2.3.1C) are supported but are concerned about long term compliance and monitoring of such consent conditions. | That the Commissioners recognise the long term compliance and monitoring of consent conditions (around landscaping, hard surfacing, open space etc) as an issue in their recommendations to Council and request that adequate funding be allocated for this and that the monitoring element be recognised in the fees and charges for new infill developments. | Yes |
| 67  | 4.2.3.1A and 4.2.3.1B | The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments. | Policies 4.2.3.1A and 4.2.3.1B: reword policies so that they do need to be ‘green’ and that paved terraces and decks can be considered as open space (draft wording supplied). | Yes |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Submitted Comments</th>
<th>Council Response</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>4.2.3.1A and 4.2.3.1B</td>
<td>The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.</td>
<td>Policies 4.2.3.1A and 4.2.3.1B: policies do not reflect the rule. As decks and paved areas are considered to be open spaces under the rule, the use of the word 'green' is misleading and should be removed.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2.3.1B</td>
<td>Similarly the need for greater hard surfacing areas for vehicle access and parking detracts from the quality of the streetscape.</td>
<td>That the Council notes the comments and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.2.3.1B</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but is concerned it will reduce the potential for sites and create additional uncertainty for potential housing developments and does not provide or promote infill development in appropriate areas.</td>
<td>4.2.3.1B: generally supports hard surfacing policy, but seeks clarification that well designed hard surfaced outdoor living areas are appropriate.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.2.3.1B</td>
<td>The submitter supports PC 56, in particular ... policy 4.2.3.1B (hard surfaces).</td>
<td>To make the suggested change to DP 56.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.2.3.1B</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the plan change but consider the new provisions do not sufficiently explain the reasons for limiting impermeable site coverage. The submission outlines a variety of environmental effects that can result from increased hard surfacing of sites.</td>
<td>The Plan spells out clearly in the rules for infill housing and subdivision the hidden hazards that can arise from removing vegetation, increasing the area of permanent hardstand, increasing the flow volumes of storm-water and sewage, and earthworks.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.2.3.1B</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.2.3.1B</td>
<td>Reword this policy to remove reference to 'green open space' and amend the explanatory text</td>
<td>That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2.3.1C</td>
<td>Seeks clarification on what the policy is in regard to the preservation or replanting of mature exotic trees (refer to Policy 4.2.3.1C)?</td>
<td>That the Council notes the comments and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.2.3.1C</td>
<td>The submitters support the proposals to limit the height and site coverage of developments in residential areas. Other effects noted by the submitters include loss of privacy and sunlight, most vegetation cleared from the site and replaced with concrete or buildings and a significant increase in traffic.</td>
<td>We want the Council to restrict the amount of vegetation that can be removed from the site.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.2.3.1C</td>
<td>That there should be protection of existing vegetation, particularly mature tress (support 4.2.3.1C and 5.1.3.2B)</td>
<td>That the Council notes the comments/concerns and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.2.3.1C</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but is concerned it will reduce the potential for sites and create additional uncertainty for potential housing developments and does not provide or promote infill development in appropriate areas.</td>
<td>Policy 4.2.3.1C: supports tree and bush retention policy so seeks its retention.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.2.3.1C</td>
<td>The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.</td>
<td>Policy 4.2.3.1.C (retention of trees and bush): is supported to retain openness.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Submitters support policy 4.2.3.1C (retention of trees and bush) but consider it needs to be stronger than just &quot;encourage&quot;. To make the suggested change to DP 56 and note our comments ... regarding a suitable cross reference to WCC’s Indigenous Biodiversity Plan.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.2.3.1C</td>
<td>The submitter is generally in favour of the changes though, as a result, suspects the site coverage will be reduced to 28% and that three levels will become the norm. The submitters also note their belief that the plan change has nothing to do with the quality of housing, rather it is more about amenity. Policy 4.2.3.1C (retention of trees): needs more work as mature trees cause problems too around shading and leaf drainage disruption. Also, landscaping plans are all that are needed rather than trying to prevent the removal of trees prior to development.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.2.3.1C</td>
<td>Support this, along with G6.7, G1.12</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.2.3.1C</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.2.3.1C</td>
<td>Reword this policy to remove reference to ‘green open space’ and amend the explanatory text</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2.3.3</td>
<td>Policy 4.2.3.3. Seeks the imposition of aesthetic control over developers and architects in relation to tall solid fences, window and door size especially in areas of older or heritage housing stock.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.2.3.3</td>
<td>The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.2.3.3</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted. Policy 4.2.3.3: revised explanatory text supported as a generalised but generally accurate description.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.2.3.3</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted. Policy 4.2.3.3: “new rules are over controlling”. Prefer that any non-compliance of permitted activity thresholds move to a controlled activity status rather than directly to discretionary status. Also, the assessment of proposals against the design guides should be at the Controlled activity threshold rather than as discretionary activities.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.2.3.3</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted. Policy 4.2.3.3: “new rules are over controlling”. Prefer that any non-compliance of permitted activity thresholds move to a controlled activity status rather than directly to discretionary status. Also, the assessment of proposals against the design guides should be at the Controlled activity threshold rather than as discretionary activities.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.2.3.3</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted. Policy 4.2.3.3 (para 4): Oppose the statement that the Council will not consider the permitted baseline when considering the effects of multi-unit developments. Change the word 'will' to 'may' to ensure the Council is left with discretion to consider the permitted baseline as needed. Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.2.3.3</td>
<td>The submitter strongly supports the plan change, but seeks some minor modifications to various provisions. Particular support is given to Policy 4.2.3.3 and its explanatory text.... Approve Plan Change 56 Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>4.2.3.3</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions. Explanatory text for Policy 4.2.3.3: define what compatibility with surrounding residential environment means, hopefully it does not restrict the ascetic of new buildings outside heritage zones. Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.2.3.3</td>
<td>Amend wording of explanatory text. That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56 Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subdivision Objectives and Policies (especially policies 4.2.4.1 - 4.2.4.1A)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.2.4</td>
<td>The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined. Objective 4.2.4 (subdivisions): changes are supported, especially the paragraph that discusses the height of second dwellings and the triggers for it. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.2.4</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted. Policy 4.2.2.1B (para 9) and 4.2.4.1A (Para 6): These comments do not follow the provisions and intent set out under the RMA. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>4.2.4</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted. Policy 4.2.4.1A (para 4): Oppose the use of covenants to ensure that residential dwellings are built in accordance with the approved subdivision. We would sooner see the Council issue a consent notice to limit the height of a future dwelling than restrict the nature of the design. Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>4.2.4</td>
<td>The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments. Policy 4.2.4.1A: a small wording change is requested to this policy (draft wording supplied). Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.2.4</td>
<td>General support, but there are some elements that require amendments. That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee. Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.2.4</td>
<td>Some minor wording changes to the explanatory text. That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2.4.1</td>
<td>Policy 4.2.4.1/Rule 5.3.4.12. Notes the overlooking adjacent properties might be mitigated by placing new dwellings obliquely or at an angle. That the Council notes the comments and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision. No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter 5: Residential Area Rules**

**Vehicle Parking and Access**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1.1.2</td>
<td>One car park per unit is necessary and acceptable and asks that the Council actively assist residents to provide off-street parking (rather than providing disincentives eg. increased encroachment fees etc). Seeks that the Council stay with the current status quo and enforce existing rules and regulations properly. Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.1.1.2</td>
<td>The submitter makes a number of comments regarding infill housing and Council processes, as outlined in the decision requested. Seeks that developers be required to consider more off-street parking as one park per house is usually not enough for the number of cars per household, putting a strain on streets that are already at capacity. No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.1.1.2</td>
<td>The submitter does not however support the visitor car parking requirement if it entails removing the front fence as street level to provide a car pad for 3-4 vehicles as this would create visual pollution and be hazardous to pedestrians. Support for the visitor car parking requirements is only provided if the parking is provided at the rear of a site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.1.1.2</td>
<td>The submitter supports the proposed visitor car parking requirement as street parking is already at a premium in many parts of the city and infill development puts a further strain on this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.1.1.2</td>
<td>The submitter notes that there are a number of issues that have come to light since the Plan was notified that require further clarification. These are mostly minor matters, and as such, may not be picked up by other submitters on the Plan Change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.1.1.2</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but is concerned it will reduce the potential for sites and create additional uncertainty for potential housing developments and does not provided or promote infill development in appropriate areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.1.1.2</td>
<td>The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.1.1.2</td>
<td>The submitter is generally in favour of the changes though, as a result, suspects the site coverage will be reduced to 28% and that three levels will become the norm. The submitters also note their belief that the plan change has nothing to do with the quality of housing, rather it is more about amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.1.1.2</td>
<td>The submitter cites numerous concerns about the Plan Change and opposes it in its entirety, specifically Rule 5.1.1.2: visitor parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.1.1.2</td>
<td>The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.1.1.2</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.1.1.2</td>
<td>Seeks amendments to provide greater clarity. Transpose final statement to sit before the bullet point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.1.1.3</td>
<td>Site access changes supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.1.3.4</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rule 5.1.3.4 and 5.3.1.6: Conflict between the urban design requirements for carparking and the rule requiring carparking. Consider reducing the carparking on site rule in inner residential areas or hill-side sites if they are close to public transport routes.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.1.3.4</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rule 5.1.3.4 and 5.3.1.6: Conflict between the urban design requirements for carparking and the rule requiring carparking. Consider reducing the carparking on site rule in inner residential areas or hill-side sites if they are close to public transport routes.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.1.3.4</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rule 5.1.3.4 and 5.3.1.6: Conflict between the urban design requirements for carparking and the rule requiring carparking. Consider reducing the carparking on site rule in inner residential areas or hill-side sites if they are close to public transport routes.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Permitted Subdivision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.1.11</td>
<td>The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rule 5.1.11: lower the thresholds and information requirements for meeting a permitted activity subdivision.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Permitted Building Standards (includes open space, height of second unit, existing uses rule)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.1.3</td>
<td>The submitter seeks some wording amendments to three parts of the plan change to acknowledge that neighbours, other than immediately adjoining neighbours, can be affected by infill developments and secondly the loss of sound amenity (through increased noise) is also a valid effect that needs consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rule 5.1.3.A4: in first para of explanatory text, the words &quot;both visual and sound&quot; before the word ‘amenity’ at the end of first para.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The submitter supports the Plan Change, in particular the open space provisions... The submitter cites concerns about poor quality development in his neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That the plan change rules are supported</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The proposed new 50sq.metre open space is far too excessive for the needs of residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seeks that the Council stay with the current status quo and enforce existing rules and regulations properly.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The submitter opposes the provisions especially the ... amount of open space required and the manner in which the plan change was implemented. The Submitter considers the plan change will stifle city growth, push land prices up, encourage urban sprawl and the proliferation of tiny single level dwellings. The plan change has wide ranging effect that has not been well thought out and cuts across citizens property rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That the Council fully consult with not only residents that don't want change but industry and those that wish to live in areas affected to develop a reasonable approach.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The submitter supports tighter controls on subdivision as well as the design guide, the reduction of the permitted height for the second unit on a site and the open space requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open space requirement for the Inner (35sq.m) and Outer Residential Areas (50 sq.m)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The submitter fully supports ...introducing open space requirements for each dwelling...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate open space provide to allow for lawns and gardens</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The submitter agrees with the main pointers of the Plan Change to improve the quality of infill housing but does note one particular reservation regarding the open space requirement. One concern is that the open space requirement is not justified or will be feasible for all proposed new dwellings in Wellington, given the size of sections in Wellington and also Wellington's climate. However the submitter does state that buildings should not be built too close to each other either so believes boundary restrictions are necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>That the Council notes the comments/concerns and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The submitter supports the open space requirement as this will assist in protecting the amenity of residential areas by ensuring dwellings are not cramped in and will provide a sense of space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The submitter supports all changes currently proposed and would like these to remain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>They support the new open space requirement and believe that residents who require no open space have the option of apartment dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>That the Council notes the comments/concerns and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The submitter strongly supports the ... open space requirement given experiences of infill housing in their local neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>That the Council note the submitters concerns about infill housing and the lack of concern for current property owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The submitter does recognise that changes need to be made on this issue, but notes concerns with ... the open space requirement...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>That the Council note the concerns of the submitter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>Rule 5.1.3.2B (open space): supported, but how will this be monitored?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The submitter outlines a number of significant concerns with the plan change Rule 5.1.3.2B: requirement to remove parking or manoeuvring areas from open space limits permissible density of development beyond the permitted site coverage rule and should not be adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The submitter opposes the open space requirement (5.1.3.2.B) and instead suggests a density limit of dwellings per site area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>That the Committee consider the elements of opposition and introduce a density limit of dwellings per site area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The submitter makes comments on the reasonableness of ... the minimum width requirement of the open space areas (5.1.3.2B).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>That the minimum width of the outdoor area in Outer Residential Areas be reduced to 3m to allow greater flexibility in the placement of infill housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The submitter is generally in favour of the changes though, as a result, suspects the site coverage will be reduced to 28% and that three levels will become the norm. The submitters also note their belief that the plan change has nothing to do with the quality of housing, rather it is more about amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The submitter cites numerous concerns about the Plan Change and opposes it in its entirety, specifically Rule 5.1.3.2.B: open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>That plan change 56 not be approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Rule</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The submitter opposes the following provision as they are far too restrictive and onerous: Rule 5.1.3.2B (open space).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The submitter strongly supports plan change 56, in particular rule 5.1.3.2B (open space requirement) as this will encourage more gardens and...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council’s discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The submitter opposes three key rules in PC 56 as well as the associated objectives and policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The submitter strongly supports the plan change, but seeks some minor modifications to various provisions. Particular support is given to ... including the new open space rule (5.1.3.2B) ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>The submittter does not support Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) or Rule 5.1.3.2B (open space) as the existing residential rules for bulk and location are adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>Seek numerous changes to the wording of this rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.1.3.2B</td>
<td>Some minor wording changes to the rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter supports the Plan Change, in particular ... the imposition of a one storey height provision. The submitter cites concerns about poor quality development in his neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>Similarly limiting the height of a second dwelling to 4.5m is unrealistic as most of Wellington’s sections are copping in nature and excessive excavation can lead to bigger problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter opposes the provisions especially the height limit ... and the manner in which the plan change was implemented. The Submitter considers the plan change will stifle city growth, push land prices up, encourage urban sprawl and the proliferation of tiny single level dwellings. The plan change has wide ranging effect that has not been well thought out and cuts across citizens property rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The Submitter approves the restriction of a second dwelling to 4.5m and states that they understand the new rules will limit the use of excavation that allows developers to build high and meet the height planes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter opposes the provision to reduce the permitted height of a second unit to 4.5m. The submitter believes that Wellington’s topography plus the smallish size of many infill sites would make development of those sites impractical if a 4.5m height is imposed. The submittter notes that most dwellings in Wellington are not single storey and is concerned that the proposal will encourage urban sprawl and a consequential increase in motor use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter supports tighter controls on subdivision as well as the design guide, the reduction of the permitted height for the second unit on a site and the open space requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter cites concerns relating to an infill development adjacent to theirs and notes that infill housing should not be substandard and should be single storey houses or units which do not obstruct the sun from existing properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter suggests amendments to the 4.5m height rule for second units on a site stating that consideration needs to be given to topography where a single dwelling may not be practical from a design perspective or meet the demand created by the changing demographics or unique characteristics of Wellington.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter would like height restrictions on new dwellings especially where they could block sun and views to existing neighbours and the submitter supports greater discretion in the subdivision process to ensure better quality outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter also supports the proposed rule to limit the height of a second unit on a site, stating this is especially important because of Wellington’s topography. The submitter accepts that property purchases accept the effects of existing dwellings that may overlook a property, but suggests that the construction of new double storey infill dwellings can adversely affect properties (eg. privacy, visual dominance and shading). Neighbours need to have the opportunity to raise their concerns regarding new dwellings greater than 4.5m in height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitters support the proposals to limit the height and site coverage of developments in residential areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but is concerned it will reduce the potential for sites and create additional uncertainty for potential housing developments and does not provided or promote infill development in appropriate areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter strongly supports the reduction of the bulk and scale of infill housing ... given experiences of infill housing in their local neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter does recognise that changes need to be made on this issue, but notes concerns with the height of the second unit rule...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter opposes the proposed bulk and location rules (in particular rule 5.1.3.4.3) as it will mean fewer developments will fit within the rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>Other provisions supported include rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of 2nd unit).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter supports PC 56, in particular ... rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of 2nd unit).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter supports PC 56, in particular rules 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) ... This support stems from concern that an adjoining property may be developed which will create privacy issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter outlines a number of significant concerns with the plan change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter supports the intentions of the Plan Change, but notes some issues that require further modification. These include ... rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) especially in respect of building on hillsides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) is also opposed due to the many steep sites making the rule restrictive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter makes comments on the reasonableness of rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) and ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter strongly supports the following rules and policies: 4.2.2.1A and 4.2.2.1B, rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter cites numerous concerns about the Plan Change and opposes it in its entirety, specifically Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) and rule 5.3.4b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter seeks two changes to PC 56. These include the need to insert a definition for an 'Infill Household Unit' and to amend the wording of Proposed Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of a second unit) in order to make it explicitly clear that comprehensive multi-unit housing developments are not subject to rule 5.1.3.4.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amend the wording of 5.1.3.4.3 so that the word 'second' is replaced with the word 'infill'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter seeks two changes to PC 56. These include the need to insert a definition for an 'Infill Household Unit' and to amend the wording of Proposed Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of a second unit) in order to make it explicitly clear that comprehensive multi-unit housing developments are not subject to rule 5.1.3.4.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Include an advice note after rule 5.1.3.4.3 to indicate that: “for the avoidance of doubt multi-unit development of three or more dwellings requiring resource consent from Rule 5.3.4, 5.4.6 or 5.4.8 are not subject to this 4.5m height restriction on their second or third household units.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit): “This clause seems to be a sledge hammer cracking a peanut”. We suggest that the residential design guide be used instead to protect privacy as a controlled use assessment criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter opposes the following provision as they are far too restrictive and onerous: Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That the Plan Change is revoked in its entirety and that Council embark on comprehensive consultation with the public and building industry rather than pass its legislation down in such a draconian manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit): “This clause seems to be a sledge hammer cracking a peanut”. We suggest that the residential design guide be used instead to protect privacy as a controlled use assessment criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit): “This clause seems to be a sledge hammer cracking a peanut”. We suggest that the residential design guide be used instead to protect privacy as a controlled use assessment criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter notes particular concerns over two provisions, being ... rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) and the consequential pressure it may place on development in Suburban Centre Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Re: Suburban Centres – the introduction (very soon) of rules applying to the Suburban Centre that more specifically address the effects on adjoining residential areas of “permitted maximum infill developments” of suburban centre areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rule 5.1.3.4.3: Height of second unit rule is unreasonable and impractical due to Wellington’s topography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter strongly supports plan change 56, ... rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) to ensure privacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>That the Committee note the support of the submitter.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.

Rule 5.1.3.4.3: That the rule be deleted or at least modified to take into account the physical characteristics of building on sloping sites. Concerns how this rule will work with future earthworks rules. Note that concern stems from where the height of buildings are measured from. Suggest that the 8m height limit be taken from the ground floor level for proposed buildings on the excavated parts of the building platform (rather than existing ground level or assessed ground level). This would avoid the ability of people being able to gain extra building height by undertaking earthworks, creating 3 storey dwellings in some areas.

Yes

The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council’s discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.

Rule 5.1.3.4.3: Delete this rule as the 4.5m height limit is very restrictive even for flat sites and extremely difficult on sloping sites. Likely to encourage stepped houses on sloped sites with rooftop decks and mono-pitched rooves. If the rule isn’t deleted, consider instead a rule similar to the ‘deck in side boundary rule’ (5.1.3.1.5A) which controls the location of habitable room windows in the vicinity of a boundary (draft wording supplied). Also note that the reference to 1000m² site in this rule should be 800m² to be consistent with assessment criteria 5.3.14.11.

Yes

The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.

Rule 5.1.3.4.3: a 4.5m height restriction is likely to be impractical on slopes in excess of 22.5 degrees. Consideration could be given to allowing higher buildings on steeper slopes if earthworks are to be minimised.

Yes

The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.

Rule 5.1.3.4.3 and link to clause 5.3.4.4 and the non-notification statements needs further checking as these references seems irrelevant.

Yes

The submitter supports the intent of the Plan Change, but identified several areas of change or clarification required (specifically lot size and coverage, second dwelling, views and notification processes).

Rule 5.1.3.4.3: should make it clear it applies to sites where the existing dwelling is or will be demolished, ie. infill housing should not proceed on the basis that a second unit can be constructed to 8m if the existing property is or has to be removed.

Yes

The submitter opposes three key rules in PC 56 as well as the associated objectives and policies.

Delete Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of a second dwelling) and consequential rules (5.3.3.3, 5.3.4B and assessment criteria) and any associated wording changes to the objectives and policies relating to these provisions.

Yes

The submitter disagrees with rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) being restricted to a single storey. There is a contradiction in that there should be minimum open space which becomes impossible to meet depending on building size and section area.

That the restriction (rule 5.1.3.4.3) be amended so that two storeys or more should be allowed to achieve the minimum open space requirements and in keeping with the neighbourhood.

Yes
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter opposes the whole plan change in its entirety, noting that the changes proposed have significantly restricted the ability for the efficient use and development of land to occur … particular mention is made of rule 5.1.3.4.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter opposes the whole plan change in its entirety, noting that the changes proposed have significantly restricted the ability for the efficient use and development of land to occur … particular mention is made of rule 5.1.3.4.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>The submitter does not support Rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit) or Rule 5.1.3.2B (open space) as the existing residential rules for bulk and location are adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>Support this rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>Is this height limit measured from above mean sea level? And seek further clarification for the explanatory text to this rule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.1.3.4.3</td>
<td>Seeks clarification of how the rule would apply if all neighbouring houses are two storey. Adding a single storey as a permitted activity would disrupt the character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.1.3A</td>
<td>The submitter notes that there are a number of issues that have come to light since the Plan was notified that require further clarification. These are mostly minor matters, and as such, may not be picked up by other submitters on the Plan Change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.1.3A</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but is concerned it will reduce the potential for sites and create additional uncertainty for potential housing developments and does not provided or promote infill development in appropriate areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.1.3A</td>
<td>The submitter supports the intentions of the Plan Change, but notes some issues that require further modification. These include the new permitted activity rule for existing uses (5.1.3A) and …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.1.3A</td>
<td>The submitter supports plan change 56 as a positive step towards improving the quality of infill housing. However the submitter has particular concerns with proposed new rule 5.1.3A (existing uses permitted activity standard), particularly that it does not make provision for sites that exceed site coverage to be within the scope of the rule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.1.3A</td>
<td>The submitter cites numerous concerns about the Plan Change and opposes it in its entirety, specifically Rule 5.1.3A: existing uses permitted activity standard, specifically 4.5m height restriction for additions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.1.3A</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.1.3A</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.1.3A</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>5.1.3A</td>
<td>The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.1.3A</td>
<td>The submitter strongly supports the plan change, but seeks some minor modifications to various provisions. A detailed submission is made on Rule 5.1.3A relating to existing uses, which outlines the history of that provision from the submitter's perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>5.1.3A</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.1.3A</td>
<td>Support sentiment of rule, but it prescribes the footprint as being exempt and that elevation and section of existing building are not exempt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.1.3A</td>
<td>Definition needed for &quot;existing building footprint&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.1.3A</td>
<td>Corrects typing error</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discretionary Restricted Residential Rules (includes infill and multi-unit rule, subdivision)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.3.1</td>
<td>Seek definition of what is meant by &quot;streetscape&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.3.3</td>
<td>The submitter notes that there are a number of issues that have come to light since the Plan was notified that require further clarification. These are mostly minor matters, and as such, may not be picked up by other submitters on the Plan Change.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.3.3</td>
<td>The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.3.3</td>
<td>The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.3.3</td>
<td>The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.3.3</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.3.3</td>
<td>wording addition sought to 5.3.3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.3.3.3</td>
<td>The submitter notes that there are a number of issues that have come to light since the Plan was notified that require further clarification. These are mostly minor matters, and as such, may not be picked up by other submitters on the Plan Change.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.3.3.3</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.3.3.3</td>
<td>wording addition sought to 5.3.3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open Space Provisions: early implementation of these provisions has revealed a need for the planners to have greater flexibility in dealing with waivers of the open space requirement. It is proposed that Policy 4.2.3.1A and the assessment criteria in Rule 5.3.3 be amended to provide greater discretion. Such discretion would be expanded to cover the situation where the application has been fully assessed against the Residential Design Guide by the Council's urban designers and the proposal receives a very favourable urban design assessment, i.e. an excellent design concept for the development along with high quality private open spaces (though less than what the rule requires) can still meet the intent of the policy. Two other minor wording changes to the rule are also proposed for further clarity.

Correction: correct an incorrect reference to 5.1.4.3.4 found in rule 5.3.3 so that it reads 5.1.3.4.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</th>
<th>Rule 5.3.4: add additional assessment criteria regarding the ability of the proposal to meet Wellington's housing needs.</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the Plan Change but is concerned it will reduce the potential for sites and create additional uncertainty for potential housing developments and does not provide or promote infill development in appropriate areas.</td>
<td>Rule 5.3.4: add additional assessment criteria regarding the ability of the proposal to meet Wellington's housing needs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>The submitters strongly support PC56 in order that the dramatic impacts of infill housing be dealt with before the character of older suburbs is ruined.</td>
<td>5.3.4.6 and 5.3.4.7: also strongly supported.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>The submitter cites numerous concerns about the Plan Change and opposes it in its entirety, specifically Assessment criteria for rule 5.3.4a and 5.3.4b, 5.3.10</td>
<td>That plan change 56 not be approved.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>The submitter seeks some wording amendments to three parts of the plan change to acknowledge that neighbours, other than immediately adjoining neighbours, can be affected by infill developments and secondly the loss of sound amenity (through increased noise) is also a valid effect that needs consideration.</td>
<td>5.3.4.6: At the end of criterion before 'to adjoining sites', the words &quot;or significant increase in noise levels&quot; be added.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
<td>Believe that the perceived problems that initiated PC56 is more a problem with multi-unit developments than adding a second unit. Use the &quot;controlled use&quot; assessment criteria for second household units so that they are treated differently from multi-unit developments.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
<td>Rule 5.1.3A and Rule 5.3.4: these clauses are prohibitive to good urban design. Seek that the maximum height of 4.5m in Rule 5.1.3A and of 7m in rule 5.3.4 are deleted and that the residential design guide is introduced as a controlled use assessment criteria to allow design to be considered for each specific site.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
<td>Believe that the perceived problems that initiated PC56 is more a problem with multi-unit developments than adding a second unit. Use the &quot;controlled use&quot; assessment criteria for second household units so that they are treated differently from multi-unit developments.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
<td>Rule 5.1.3A and Rule 5.3.4: these clauses are prohibitive to good urban design. Seek that the maximum height of 4.5m in Rule 5.1.3A and of 7m in rule 5.3.4 are deleted and that the residential design guide is introduced as a controlled use assessment criteria to allow design to be considered for each specific site.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
<td>Believe that the perceived problems that initiated PC56 is more a problem with multi-unit developments than adding a second unit. Use the &quot;controlled use&quot; assessment criteria for second household units so that they are treated differently from multi-unit developments.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Submitter's Position</td>
<td>Proposed Changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
<td>Rule 5.1.3A and Rule 5.3.4: these clauses are prohibitive to good urban design. Seek that the maximum height of 4.5m in Rule 5.1.3A and of 7m in Rule 5.3.4 are deleted and that the residential design guide is introduced as a controlled use assessment criteria to allow design to be considered for each specific site. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
<td>Rule 5.3.4b: Seek that the 7m height limit in the standards and terms of this rule be revised to 8m to be consistent with the existing maximum height provisions. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.</td>
<td>Rule 5.3.4a and 5.3.4b: amend drafting of non-notification statement and standards and terms (in particular change the 7m height limit in S&amp;T to be 8m plus the 1m pitched roof allowance [draft wording supplied]). Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.</td>
<td>Rule 5.3.4B: amend the standard and terms for this rule to allow the height of buildings to be 8m “plus the 1m gable end allowance”. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.</td>
<td>Rule 5.3.4: standards and terms limiting height to 7m should extend to 8m. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>The submitter supports the intent of the Plan Change, but identified several areas of change or clarification required (specifically lot size and coverage, second dwelling, views and notification processes).</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide and Rule 5.3.4.7: the Plan should recognise that the view from existing houses is as significant an issue related to amenity value as being overlooked by new developments. Amend rule 5.3.4.7 to provide a reference to the ‘blocking of significant existing viewshafts”. Include this also in the commentary on the rule. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.</td>
<td>Rule 5.3.4.11: (kerb side parking): admirable provision but how it is to be monitored? Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>Support, but seek some changes to the notification statement and the standards and terms to provide clarity</td>
<td>That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee. Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.3.4</td>
<td>Some minor wording changes to the rule</td>
<td>That the Council review and revise the Proposed Plan Change 56 Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.3.4.10</td>
<td>The submitter notes particular concerns over two provisions, being the consideration of vegetation removed prior to subdivision and …</td>
<td>Reconsideration of the “2 year” reference in relation to the removal of trees and vegetation prior to infill subdivision/development. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>5.3.4.10</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted.</td>
<td>5.3.4.10 and 5.3.4.11: oppose these provisions (assessment of the removal of trees) as being not fair or reasonable to retrospectively penalise someone for removing trees as a permitted activity or where those trees have been removed by a previous owner. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.3.4.10</td>
<td>The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.</td>
<td>Assessment Criteria 5.3.4.9 and 5.3.4.10: Delete criterion 5.3.4.10, as the requirement to provide a landscaping plan and criterion 5.3.4.9 is sufficient to manage the effects of new development.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.3.10.9</td>
<td>The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.</td>
<td>Assessment Criteria 5.3.10.9 and 5.3.10.12. Delete 5.3.10.12 as it overlaps with 5.3.10.9.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>The submitter does not agree with the proposed subdivision rules for the following reasons. 1. The rules will mean an end to any subdivision in the greater Wellington area. The imposition of the 35% coverage and 4.5m height rules will mean nobody with an averaged sized section of 700sq.m will be able to build another house on it because the value of the second house will be outweighed by the costs of the subdivision/building project. 2. The ‘protection of the character of Wellington City’ is not a plausible rationale for the proposal because the inner city areas are already subdivided. 3. Preventing subdivision and infilling of northern suburbs will not change the current image of the city. 4. The proposal represents a cynical and unwarranted intrusion into property rights and its effect will only push house prices higher.</td>
<td>That the Council notes the concerns of the submitter in making its decision, particularly in respect of the proposed changes to the subdivision provisions.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>The submitter supports tighter controls on subdivision as well as the design guide, the reduction of the permitted height for the second unit on a site and the open space requirements.</td>
<td>Tighter controls on subdivisions and the design guide</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>Other provisions supported include … rule 5.3.14 (subdivision assessed against the residential design guide).</td>
<td>That the Council note the areas of support by the submitter.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>The submitter considers the Council is taking a wrong step with the proposed new subdivision rules. The rules should be softer not more difficult. … Concerned this will force people further and further away from Wellington and in turn putting pressure on transport infrastructure.</td>
<td>That the committee note the concerns of the submitter and make the subdivision rules more lenient (eg. site coverage 50%)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>The submitter supports the plan change but believes that minimum lot sizes should be reintroduced due to the current rule based planning not meeting the expectation of providing a high standard of infill development. Rule 5.3.3, 5.4.5, policy 4.2.4.1 and the amended design guide for subdivision are acknowledged, but concern remains that without a concrete minimum lot size the status quo will continue.</td>
<td>Minimum lot size be reintroduced</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>The submitter cites numerous concerns about the Plan Change and opposes it in its entirety, specifically Deletion of the controlled activity subdivision rules (5.2.5A and b) and replacement by rule 5.3.14</td>
<td>That plan change 56 not be approved.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>The submitter cites numerous concerns about the Plan Change and opposes it in its entirety, specifically Assessment criteria in rule 5.3.14, especially 5.3.14.11.</td>
<td>That plan change 56 not be approved.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the intent of the change but has several concerns with the Plan Change, as noted</td>
<td>Rule 5.3.14: There should be a controlled activity rule that allows for subdivisions that create allotments of over 400m$^2$, where a permitted activity dwelling will comply with the lot. There are some instances where a minimum lot size would be useful and make the subdivision process more straight forward.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.</td>
<td>Rule 5.2.5A and 5.2.5B (Controlled Activity Subdivision rules – deleted from PC56): concerned with the loss of controlled activity subdivision and seek that it be retained, but acknowledge the only way to do so is to introduce a minimum area or shape factor as this will provide Council with the level of assurance it appears to seek. If minimum area adopted, recommend 350m$^2$ - 400m$^2$. Controlled activity subdivisions will work well for cross lease and unit title situations, for boundary adjustments (that do not create new non-compliances or for vacant lots greater than say 350-400m$^2$) and for subdivision around existing buildings where the permitted activity conditions in rule 5.1.11 cannot be met.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>The submitter opposes some aspects of the Plan Change, stating that PC56 is an overreaction and that the rules create uncertainty due to the increase in Council's discretion. The submitter seeks the deletion of a number of provisions, or if not deleted, provides alternative wording.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>Rule 5.3.14: seek the retention of earthworks as a matter for discretion. Drafting of standards and terms requires some minor changes (draft wording supplied). Delete reference in 5.3.14.12 to a minimum lot size figure (400m²), or if the figure remains a more realistic figure would be 350m². Concerns about subjective and leading nature of 5.3.14.13.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>Assessment Criterion 5.3.14.13: Delete this, or at least rewrite to reflect the fact that infill housing is a desirable activity which has benefits to the city.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>Rule 5.3.14 (b): retain cross-lease and unit title subdivision around consented and existing buildings as Controlled Activities as these subdivisions are simply a method of space allocation and do not change land use patterns. Where a combined landuse and unit title subdivision is being considered, the submitter suggests that a Standard and Term be placed in the Controlled Activity rule that requires landuse consent to be obtained to the development. Where consent is not granted for the building, a subdivision consent under rule 5.4.5 is proposed.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>New Controlled Activity Rule for Boundary Adjustments: Add a new rule to provide controlled activity status for boundary adjustments that do not create vacant allotments or increase the degree of non-compliance for existing buildings.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>Rule 5.3.14: note that one assessment criteria refers to a lot size of 400m². Suggest that it is not lot size that is important but rather lot shape so suggest introduction of a shape factor as a guide to the development potential of new lots.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>The submitter supports the intent of the Plan Change, but identified several areas of change or clarification required (specifically lot size and coverage, second dwelling, views and notification processes).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>5.3.14</td>
<td>The submitter opposes three key rules in PC 56 as well as the associated objectives and policies.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The submitters support the plan change which regulates the size and shape of new infill housing. The submitters are particularly concerned that new subdivisions on unstable hillsides, which will increase the number of dwellings, will only accentuate potential instability. That new limits on the amount of dwellings within an area of land be required to reduce destabilisation. Unknown

The submitters focus on aspects of the plan change that need greater emphasis, including the environmental impacts of infill (eg. city green corridors, existing watersheds, amenity value of greenscape, quality and durability of buildings, the living quality of people). The consideration of these environmental effects should be in the context of subdivision and residential building standards as well as the city greenscape/watershed management. No

Strongly support proposal that subdivisions are Discretionary (Restricted) Activities. That the Committee note the support and address the amendments sought above. Unknown

Interested and affected parties should be notified of any intent for an applicant to seek subdivision consent regardless of whether the consent will be publicly notified. Seek some changes to the assessment criteria, and clarification around some terms. Would like the Code of Practice for Land Development referred to. That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee. Unknown

The submitter seeks amendments in relation to rule 5.3.14.8 regarding the need for greater consideration of storm water capacity to cope with additional infill housing. That the following specific concerns are added to Plan Change 56. 1. That appropriate stormwater drainage has sufficient cubic capacity to service additional apartments or flats added to an original one home property. 2. If it does not, that an appropriate secondary flow path is reserved. 3. That all new apartments or flats added have a water toby with access for the Council on nearby Council land (for accurate water metering charges if they occur). No

**Discretionary Unrestricted Residential Rules (specifically subdivision)**

| 38 | 5.4.5 | The submitter outlines a number of significant concerns with the plan change | Assessment Criterion 5.4.5.2B: delete as it is unworkable. | Yes |
| 67 | 5.4.5 | The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments. | Rule 5.4.5: suggest minor changes to assessment criteria to remove subjective nature of drafting. | Yes |
| 70 | 5.4.5 | The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters. | Rule 5.4.5: Clarify how a restricted discretionary subdivision can become an unrestricted discretionary activity. Believe that subdivision of a site should not be any more restrictive that any land use consent needed for activities on a site. | Yes |
| 44 | 5.4.5 | Support | That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee. | Unknown |

**Comments on Notification Provisions**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notification</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The submitter supports the Plan Change ... The submitter cites concerns about poor quality development in his neighbourhood.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Submitter supports the intent of the proposed rules, but argues that the process is flawed. That is, where the decision making is delegated with no right of recourse to an independent third party such as the Environment Court, it is unlikely that the quality of infill housing will be maintained over time. Developers will end up capturing the process with more incremental additions to the “permitted baseline” resulting in further adversely affected party exclusion and alienation from the process.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The submitter makes a number of comments regarding infill housing and Council processes, as outlined in the decision requested.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Concerns were also raised at the number of infill developments that have proceeded without notification.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The submitter fully supports limiting the height of the second unit to single storey, introducing open space requirements for each dwelling, tightening subdivision controls and introducing requirements for visitor car parking. The submitter cites two examples of developments in his neighbourhood to support his submission.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The submitters support the proposals to limit the height and site coverage of developments in residential areas. The submitters cite an infill development adjacent to their homes as being the reason for a supportive submission.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Other provisions supported include ... the notification statement of all multi-unit resource consent applications.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Residential amenity policy 4.2.2.1A and B and the residential design guide are supported, as is rule 5.1.3.4.3 (height of second unit).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Notification</td>
<td>The submitter supports the intent of the Plan Change, but identified several areas of change or clarification required (specifically lot size and coverage, second dwelling, views and notification processes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Notification</td>
<td>General concerns are noted with the design assessment process (which seems to have significant discretion for Council designers in interpreting the design guide). It is unclear in many cases whether neighbours will be required to give approval for minor non-compliance even if the urban designers support the application. The amount of say by neighbours should be minimised as minor encroachments can often lead to much better design outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Volume 2: Design Guides

| 12 | Residential Design Guide | Clarity on how the Residential and Subdivision Design Guides will be used, i.e., what is their status in respect of the Plan objectives and rules? | No |
| 23 | Residential Design Guide | The submitter notes that there are a number of issues that have come to light since the Plan was notified that require further clarification. These are mostly minor matters, and as such, may not be picked up by other submitters on the Plan Change. | No |
| 31 | Residential Design Guide | The submitter does not recognise that changes need to be made on this issue, but notes concerns with the ... the Residential Design Guide (which is extremely prescriptive). | Unknown |
| 35 | Residential Design Guide | The residential design guide is also supported as it restores its effectiveness in deciding the appropriate size and character of multiunit developments. | Yes |
| 38 | Residential Design Guide | The submitter outlines a number of significant concerns with the plan change. | Yes |
| 39 | Residential Design Guide | The submitter supports the intentions of the Plan Change, but notes some issues that require further modification. Concerns about the requirement in the Residential Design Guide for open spaces to be flat also presents problems for hilly sites. | Unknown |

Note comments on relevant concerns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide</td>
<td>The submitter notes that the multi-unit design guide as it exists provides all the necessary tools to control building quality, scale and amenities.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide</td>
<td>The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide</td>
<td>The submitter supports the intent of the Plan Change, but identified several areas of change or clarification required (specifically lot size and coverage, second dwelling, views and notification processes).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide</td>
<td>The submitter supports the intent of the Plan Change but does identify certain issues that need to be addressed.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide</td>
<td>Concerned also at the increase in consent applications that will require assessment against the Residential Design Guide, which on past experience, indicates that the guidelines will end up being ‘must comply with’ rather than just guidelines and further delay consent processing timeframes.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide</td>
<td>Concerned also at the increase in consent applications that will require assessment against the Residential Design Guide, which on past experience, indicates that the guidelines will end up being ‘must comply with’ rather than just guidelines and further delay consent processing timeframes.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide</td>
<td>Title of Residential Design Guide inaccurately implies that it covers a wide range of residential buildings.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide</td>
<td>Support wording on page 3 regarding ‘Design Flexibility and responsiveness to site’ and ‘relevance’.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide</td>
<td>G1.11, G1.14, G3.8: a picturesque strategy of variation, asymmetry and breaking up of large forms is preferred over symmetrical, formal and larger blocks (considered visually dominant 'evil').</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide</td>
<td>G2.2: Support this guideline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide</td>
<td>G3.10: query the significance of extending the planting and landscape patterns that characterise the wider setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide</td>
<td>G2.3: Tends to imply that orientation to the street is more important than orientation to the sun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide</td>
<td>G3.16: Service facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide</td>
<td>G2.9: do not support need for “secure weatherproof storage area or cupboard....” Inappropriate level of detail for the Council to require.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Residential Design Guide</td>
<td>The submitter has supplied a detailed outline of changes sought to various provisions of the plan change, as well as an assessment of the Residential Design Guide which outlines the guidelines are demonstrably focused on ‘externalities’ compared with those that seek to control ‘internal amenity effects’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Subdivision Design Guide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Subdivision Design Guide</td>
<td>The submitter is generally supportive of the changes, but notes particular opposition to certain changes or seeks wording amendments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Subdivision Design Guide</td>
<td>The submitter strongly supports the plan change, but seeks some minor modifications to various provisions. Particular support is given to... the Subdivision Design Guide (though for the latter noting that qualified skilled assessors will be an important part of the design review).</td>
<td>Approve Plan Change 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Subdivision Design Guide</td>
<td>G6.5: concerned about connotations of using the word use of the term “treatment” in this context. I.e. that hard surfaces and built environment are always deficient and in need of natural cover.</td>
<td>Suggest a more positive phrasing conveying a more complex understanding of the different components of design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Subdivision Design Guide</td>
<td>G6.10: support this where practical</td>
<td>That the Committee note the support and address the amendments sought above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Subdivision Design Guide</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>That the matters covered in the submission are considered by the Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23</th>
<th>Rule 7.3.5</th>
<th>The submitter notes that there are a number of issues that have come to light since the Plan was notified that require further clarification. These are mostly minor matters, and as such, may not be picked up by other submitters on the Plan Change.</th>
<th>Residential Design Guide reference: a consequential change to remove the reference to the Multi-Unit Design Guide in rule 7.3.5 (Suburban Centre multi-unit development) needs to be updated to refer to the Residential Design Guide.</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sunlight Access Plane Rules</td>
<td>The submitter also seeks that this plan change deals with concerns over the application of the Sunlight Access Plane rule, even though it is not presently subject to change in Plan Change 56. The submitter demonstrates a particular concern that the current sunlight access plane rules can allow for a situation of a 8metre high corner of a dwelling within 1m of the boundary (facilitated by a right of way adjoining the site). The submitter uses several diagrams to explain the effects that development under that rule can have on adjoining property owners and argues that this situation will become more common as more infill development (with associated right of ways) occurs.</td>
<td>The submitter would also like the Council to include a rule which addresses the sunlight access plane issue discussed by the submitter.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Sunlight Access Plane Rules</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.</td>
<td>Sunlight Access Planes: seek change to these rules to take into account differing requirements from north to south.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Sunlight Access Plane Rules</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.</td>
<td>Change the 1/3 height encroachment in include small area of corner of gable. Include mono pitched roofs.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.</td>
<td>Allow for greater site coverage where a limited upper floor is included</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.</td>
<td>Site coverage is too restrictive as it does not take into account building bulk. Site coverage can be increased if permitted bulk is reduced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sunlight Access Plane Rules</td>
<td>The submitter also seeks that this plan change deals with concerns over the application of the Sunlight Access Plane rule, even though it is not presently subject to change in Plan Change 56. The submitter demonstrates a particular concern that the current sunlight access plane rules can allow for a situation of an 8metre high corner of a dwelling within 1m of the boundary (facilitated by a right of way adjoining the site). The submitter uses several diagrams to explain the effects that development under that rule can have on adjoining property owners and argues that this situation will become more common as more infill development (with associated right of ways) occurs.</td>
<td>The submitter would also like the Council to include a rule which addresses the sunlight access plane issue discussed by the submitter. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Ground Level</td>
<td>The submitter supports the intentions of the Plan Change but would like to see a further change in regard to ground levels, ie that new buildings should not be allowed to be higher through the excavation of the ground.</td>
<td>That the Council note the areas of support by the submitter and that building heights should be measured from the level of the finished excavation. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.</td>
<td>Reduce maximum height of 8m + 1m (for pitch roof) to 7.5m except for 50% of dwelling footprint on steep sites. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.</td>
<td>Allow two storey dwellings, but control the length of upper floor to any boundary (eg 8m max) and control placement of windows and heights. Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter supports the Plan Change ... The submitter cites concerns about poor quality development in his neighbourhood.</td>
<td>Provide an opportunity for an appeal process on any infill consents granted before any work actually commences. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter makes a number of comments in relation to the proposed plan change: 1. Retaining walls already in place at time of subdivision consent need thorough inspection to be sure they are capable of supporting future development. 2. Aerial photographs need to be kept up-to-date to ensure the Council has current information about a site (eg. existing vegetation).</td>
<td>That the Council notes the comments and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter makes a number of comments regarding infill housing and Council processes, as outlined in the decision requested.</td>
<td>Likewise, developers must not inconvenience neighbours during construction. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter makes a number of comments regarding infill housing and Council processes, as outlined in the decision requested.</td>
<td>Seeks that an independent ombudsman is appointed over Councils as residential ratepayers have no where to go to have their concerns heard. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter supports the general thrust of the policy in regards to infill housing.</td>
<td>That the Council notes the comments of the submitter in making its decision. Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter fully supports limiting the height of the second unit to single storey, introducing open space requirements for each dwelling, tightening subdivision controls and introducing requirements for visitor car parking.</td>
<td>Views and sunlight enjoyed by neighbours should be preserved and adequate separation between buildings and also from boundary fences to avoid shading and dampness.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter supports improving the quality of urban design.</td>
<td>But seeks that the Council Urban Designers also provide input into the design of one or two unit developments in addition to the current three or more units on a site.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter welcomes the changes to the Council policy on infill, particularly the changes that strengthen the case for infill housing to be tempered. The submitter particularly supports limits to development opportunities and preventing change to the character of an area (this is not just style and architectural, but also social, community, amenity, wellbeing, security and safety). The submitter’s major concern is that infill has been permitted that is too close to other houses, it has allowed housing density and building quality that will lead to substandard living conditions in the future. The density also affects roading infrastructure and parking space that was not designed for more intensive use.</td>
<td>That the Council adopt the new changes that will allow more room for consideration of the above factors when planning permission is given for infill housing.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter also adds a concern about the height of trees, which can become unsafe and block sun and views to other residents and requests there be a solution implemented for trees, as well and buildings.</td>
<td>That the Council notes the comments/concerns and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter supports the generalised intentions of the Plan Change. The submitter cites the example of a development in Agra Crescent, Khandallah as being totally out of character with nearby residential properties. The current standards need to be significantly tightened to preclude such massive and out of character future developments.</td>
<td>That criteria be developed that assess individual applications as well as reserving streets and suburbs from such development that alters its character and reduces quality of life and environment for occupants. Suggestions for criteria include. 1. Sufficient space for each infill unit, which would also allow space for trees and other screening to create privacy. 2. The practice of walls being thrown up directly outside windows must not be allowed. Regards must be given to quality of life, light and views available to all. 3. Parking difficulties as more residents means more cars. 4. Building a ‘granny flat’ should be encouraged. 5. Areas and buildings with historical values and architecture need to be protected from such changes. 6. Views are not ours by right, “this needs to be amended to protect everyone and our living environment”.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter does not oppose infill housing per se, but states that we need to keep in mind that Wellington’s capacity to allow infill housing is finite unless we chose to reduce our quality of life.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>That new houses should be well insulated and not pose a safety risk to existing houses.</td>
<td>That the Council notes the comments/concerns and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>That people should have a choice of housing and lifestyle, however they believe that choice may be limited through infill housing. More data analysis of future society trends needs to be carried out.</td>
<td>That the Council notes the comments/concerns and suggestions of the submitter in making its decision.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter is encouraged by the plan change, even though as a developer of some infill housing, he realises it may make further development more difficult. The submitter queries the design assessment process.</td>
<td>Consider the adoption of a ‘design police team’, where proposed buildings go before a group of architects for sign-off or to make recommendations. Whilst not a perfect solution, it may produce better results than we are getting now.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter also seeks some amendments to further neutralise the effect of development on stormwater, suggesting a number of methods that could be referred to in the Plan.</td>
<td>To make the suggested change to DP 56 and note our comments where appropriate regarding neutralising stormwater effects.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter is particularly concerned about infill housing proposals in heritage areas and areas where provisions for view shafts are assigned, citing an example of poor infill housing in Hawker Street.</td>
<td>That infill housing is opposed in heritage listed and view shaft listed areas.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter cites a number of other suburbs in Wellington City where there is plenty of scope for infill housing.</td>
<td>That infill housing is supported in outer areas (eg. Kilbirnie, Miramar, Lyall Bay, Mount Cook, Strathmore and similar suburbs).</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter is particularly concerned about infill housing proposals in heritage areas and areas where provisions for view shafts are assigned, citing an example of poor infill housing in Hawker Street.</td>
<td>That infill housing is opposed in heritage listed and view shaft listed areas.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter cites a number of other suburbs in Wellington City where there is plenty of scope for infill housing.</td>
<td>That infill housing is supported in outer areas (eg. Kilbirnie, Miramar, Lyall Bay, Mount Cook, Strathmore and similar suburbs).</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter has concerns about the quality of infill housing and seeks that only housing that blends with the area be allowed.</td>
<td>That greater attention be given to ensuring that this plan change be written in plan language eliminating unfamiliar words and phrases that could obscure the intentions of the rule.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter requests that 1. the Council not allow developers to degrade areas of Wellington with bulky housing unsuitable for the area and blocking neighbours views and sun. 2. that developers not use materials that rust and corrode only 6 months after completion. 3. encourage more environmentally designed or converted buildings and/or additions to buildings in the Wellington area.</td>
<td>The submitter requests that 1. the Council not allow developers to degrade areas of Wellington with bulky housing unsuitable for the area and blocking neighbours views and sun. 2. that developers not use materials that rust and corrode only 6 months after completion. 3. encourage more environmentally designed or converted buildings and/or additions to buildings in the Wellington area.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter is pleased that the proposed changes dovetail with many of the concerns felt by the Committee over the seemingly uncontrolled development of infill housing.</td>
<td>Can the Council’s planning include sunshine hours as well as sunlight access to housing units.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter is generally in favour of the changes though, as a result, suspects the site coverage will be reduced to 28% and that three levels will become the norm. The submitters also note their belief that the plan change has nothing to do with the quality of housing, rather it is more about amenity.</td>
<td>A third residential zone be introduced along main arterial routes suitable for multi-unit development.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter is generally in favour of the changes though, as a result, suspects the site coverage will be reduced to 28% and that three levels will become the norm. The submitters also note their belief that the plan change has nothing to do with the quality of housing, rather it is more about amenity.</td>
<td>How will the Council administer the greatly increased workload that PC56 will generate?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter applauds plan change 56, but proposes one caveat – that council officers should have the discretion to consider multi-unit sheltered housing infill development in or near suburban centres. Sheltered housing refers to 30-45 purpose designed units grouped together for older residents.</td>
<td>Amend PC56 in favour of sheltered housing developments and make Wellington the model for New Zealand and give older folk more housing choice.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitters also note their belief that the plan change has nothing to do with the quality of housing, rather it is more about amenity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter supports the Plan Change but seeks one amendment.</td>
<td>That a supervising drain layer be appointed to keep an eye on developments and also that access ways be fully investigated.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter raises concerns to do with privacy, building height, permeable surfaces and provisions for vehicles on the development.</td>
<td>That option 3 (outlined in the section 32 report) be adopted as it controls the issues listed above.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter presents a neutral submission and offers comments, suggested amendments, and seeks clarification on a wide variety of matters.</td>
<td>Better assessment of cumulative effects onsite is appropriate.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter supports the intent of the Plan Change but does identify certain issues that need to be addressed.</td>
<td>Site amalgamation as a means of circumventing the intent of the changes needs to be addressed.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter supports the intent of the Plan Change but does identify certain issues that need to be addressed.</td>
<td>Compact urban form is not sufficient to deliver on sustainability objectives and the overall approach needs to be more holistic.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter focuses on aspects of the plan change that need greater emphasis, including the environmental impacts of infill (eg. city green corridors, existing watersheds, amenity value of greenscape, quality and durability of buildings, the living quality of people).</td>
<td>That the Council consider strengthening the provisions that relate to assessment of cumulative effects for consents.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter focuses on aspects of the plan change that need greater emphasis, including the environmental impacts of infill (eg. city green corridors, existing watersheds, amenity value of greenscape, quality and durability of buildings, the living quality of people).</td>
<td>The rules should include reference to potential impacts from poorly sited infill on the city greenscape with particular regard to the adverse effects from building in shaded and persistently damp sites</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the plan change but consider the new provisions do not sufficiently explain the reasons for limiting impermeable site coverage. The submission outlines a variety of environmental effects that can result from increased hard surfacing of sites.</td>
<td>That the Council produce a booklet, which gives an understanding of the relationships between underlying geotechnics, vegetation and earthworks involved in infill housing to land stability and catchment run-off issues.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the Plan change, but notes some additional comments.</td>
<td>The submitter seeks 1. More creative use of existing buildings. 2. Pedestrian friendly access and driveways. 3. Mixed uses. eg commercial and residential . 4. Historic character empathy.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submitter generally supports the proposed changes but notes some additional comments.</td>
<td>The submitter seeks: 1. More provision for mixed use 2. Better provisions for character areas 3. And better facilities for subdivisions.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.</td>
<td>Seek that a committee of urban designers, town planners and designers be formed to come up with a better outcome than the proposed changes.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.</td>
<td>Permitted Baseline: should be able to be used to promote the merits of a proposal. Agree it has been abused in the past but good clear rules should address this.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>The submission is the result of the combined effort of five architectural designers. All support the intent of the proposal but seek some clarification and amendments to numerous provisions.</td>
<td>Seek rules to define what privacy can be expected (suggestions offered).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>