

Wellington City Proposed District Plan

REPORT 3A

APPENDIX 3.2

High Density Residential Zone

Recommended Responses to Submissions and Further Submissions

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Abby and Amos Leota	27.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes the zoning of the Northern Linden, Tawa area (from Coates street walkway back to Wall Park) as a High Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Considers that the walking access of the Northern Linden, Tawa area (from Coates street walkway back to Wall Park) to basic amenities is poor. Linden Shops is over 800m (of hillside) walking distance and access to Keneperu Station is difficult.</p> <p>Considers that the two road entry/exit points (Coates Avenue and Handyside Street via Collins Ave) to service the Northern Linden, Tawa area (from Coates street walkway back to Wall Park) have poor visibility, are narrow, and only one side of both streets have a footpath.</p> <p>The Coates Avenue intersection has issues with the pedestrian crossing safety.</p> <p>Considers that the high-density rating of the Northern Linden, Tawa area (from Coates street walkway back to Wall Park) is inconsistent with other urban areas. Other locations in Linden which are within 5-10 minutes from a railway station are zoned differently e.g. Handyside Street with better access to amenities and the station and more suitable for high-density is 11m.</p>	Seeks that the northern Linden, Tawa area is rezoned to Medium Density Residential Area [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Abby and Amos Leota	27.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	<p>Considers that there are no available provisions for additional Open Space zones in this proposed high density Northern Linden, Tawa area (from Coates street walkway back to Wall Park) apart from Wall Park which is on a hillside and adjacent to the new Keneperu Link Road to Transmission Gully.</p> <p>This area is surrounded by the Keneperu industrial area and Transmission Gully, impacting beautification, and increasing noise and air pollution.</p> <p>A lack of Open Space impacts the quality of life for residents.</p>	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Gregory Webber	33.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support in part	Not against higher density housing in Newtown in specific areas that have a lesser impact on surrounding residents.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.217	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
Gregory Webber	33.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that there is a lack of specificity regarding existing residents' right to sunlight (on Green Street). This could adversely affect house values.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.218	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
Greg Coyle	39.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that any building over two storeys will shade roof-top solar panels and make these useless. Therefore written approval should be required if development is occurring next to a site with solar panels.	Seeks that neighbours' approval is required for any development next to a site that has roof top solar panels.	Reject	No
Owen Watson	51.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that a 'transition zone' of at least one property wide be required between any Character Precinct border and a High Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No
Graham Mexted (No 2) Family Trust	66.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes HRZ zoning of 130 Main Road, Tawa. <p>The building has been office space from the Tawa Borough Council use and rated commercially (rates & water) i.e. non-residential. It is currently used commercially as a cafe. At no time has the current owner used the building for residential use, as the Tawa Borough Council converted it into offices.</p>	Rezone 130 Main Road, Tawa from High Density Residential Zone to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Addressed in Report 4C	
George North	67.1	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	Supports housing densification in Wellington. Urban sprawl costs the city far more than dense buildings due to bus lines, pipes and powerlines. The character of Wellington comes from the people, and the people are priced out and stressed from rent prices. Denser housing will allow a modern history to develop, rather than trapping Wellington in the past.	Retain High Density Residential Zone chapter as notified.	Reject	No
Judith Graykowski	80.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ new six-storey buildings will make existing neighbours' houses shadier, damper, less healthy, and unpleasant to live in.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Judith Graykowski	80.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that design requirements for multi-unit residential developments should be strengthened to future-proof buildings and provide for good community experience.</p> <p>Considers that the provisions for recession planes, privacy, outlook space and solar access (HRZ-S3, HRZ-S14, and HRZ-S15) are very limited and simply not adequate, given the buildings in the HRZ can go right to site boundaries.</p>	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Judith Graykowski	80.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that allowing 21 metres height to adjoin designated character areas could create towering buildings that dominate the neighbourhood.	<p>Seeks that more of a transition zone is allowed for at the boundary of Character Precincts or Heritage Areas.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject	No
Aro Valley Community Council	87.36	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	<p>Considers that the proposed HRZ zoning will counterintuitively slow down development in Aro Valley.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for details]</p>	Seeks that land zoned High Density Residential Zone is zoned Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No
Generation Zero	F554.40	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing.</p> <p>Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.</p>	Accept	No
Aro Valley Community Council	87.37	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that 39 Palmer Street should be considered Character Precinct as it is contiguous with four cottages 32-38 Aro Street that are listed Heritage buildings. They were built on the same section and to the same plans in 1879 and not subdivided until 1925.</p> <p>Boffa Miskell Pre 1930 Review recommends research into Potential Historic Heritage and inclusion in areas of Contiguous Character.</p>	Seeks that 39 Palmer Street be considered as being an area of Contiguous Character to Items 11.1, 11.2, 11.3 and 11.4 in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Addressed in Report 3A	

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Generation Zero	F554.41	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskell report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Addressed in Report 3A	
Aro Valley Community Council	87.38	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that 41 Palmer Street should not be zone High Density Residential as it is contiguous with four cottages 32-38 Aro Street that are listed Heritage buildings. They were built on the same section and to the same plans in 1879 and not subdivided until 1925. Boffa Miskell Pre 1930 Review recommends research into Potential Historic Heritage and inclusion in areas of Contiguous Character.	Seeks that 41 Palmer Street be considered as being an area of Contiguous Character to Items 11.1, 11.2, 11.3 and 11.4 in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Addressed in Report 3A	
Generation Zero	F554.42	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskell report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Addressed in Report 3A	
Aro Valley Community Council	87.39	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that 43 Palmer Street should not be zone High Density Residential as it is contiguous with four cottages 32-38 Aro Street that are listed Heritage buildings. They were built on the same section and to the same plans in 1879 and not subdivided until 1925. Boffa Miskell Pre 1930 Review recommends research into Potential Historic Heritage and inclusion in areas of Contiguous Character.	Seeks that 43 Palmer Street be considered as being an area of Contiguous Character to Items 11.1, 11.2, 11.3 and 11.4 in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings.	Addressed in Report 3A	

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Generation Zero	F554.43	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Addressed in Report 3A	
Aro Valley Community Council	87.40	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes zoning of all parcels on Boston Terrace as HRZ because: - A Heritage listed building needs protection on the street. - There is a lack of access for construction vehicles for future development. - There are traffic issues for vehicles accessing Aro Street.	Seeks that the sites on Boston Terrace are zoned Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept	Yes
Generation Zero	F554.44	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Reject	Yes
Aro Valley Community Council	87.41	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes zoning of properties directly North and South of 95A Aro Street as HRZ. The site is a Supported Residential Care Facility (Argo Trust) and must not have impeded access to Sunlight / Daylight from the North or East, or it will not be able to function.	Seeks that the sites to the north and east of 95A Aro Street are zoned Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Generation Zero	F554.45	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Reject	Yes
M J & P B Murtagh	98.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes unregulated high rise development for Mount Victoria as defined as the suburb is already densely populated. Considers that 21m height limit is not a good idea. Considers that Mount Victoria is densely populated, has high vehicle traffic with lack of parking, and new zoning does not account for these factors. [See original submission for further detail]	Seeks that high rise development in Mount Victoria is more strictly regulated.	Reject	No
Tawa Business Group	107.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes the zoning of 130 Main Road, Tawa as High Density Residential. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Rezone 130 Main Road, Tawa from High Density Residential Zone to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Addressed in Stream 4	
Dennis Michael Hunt	119.1	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that allowing 21m high buildings to be built on smallish sites in the HRZ block of properties between Aurora Terrace, Bolton Street, the Urban Motorway, and Wesley Road could destroy the ambience of this area and would be short-sighted.	Seeks that 21m high buildings on small isolated sites should not be allowed in the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) block of properties between Aurora Terrace, Bolton Street, the Urban Motorway, and Wesley Road while refined design concepts are still being established. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in Part	Yes
Dennis Michael Hunt	119.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that the HRZ block of properties between Aurora Terrace, Bolton Street, the Urban Motorway, and Wesley Road would suit apartment style living for students and city workers generally without children (because of the steep terrain). Sun and park-like areas should be prioritised and that exposed decks at higher levels in apartment buildings are not often used primarily due to wind. The steep terrain is advantageous for the creation of sheltered, sunny outdoor areas but would still require at least 30 metres between six-storey apartment blocks on the north east facing slope.	Seeks that a well-thought out vision is developed for accommodation which acknowledges densification and emphasizes design refinement in the HRZ block of properties between Aurora Terrace, Bolton Street, the Urban Motorway, and Wesley Road.	Reject	No
Zoe Oglivie-Burns	131.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
Anne Lian	132.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
Ingo Schommer	133.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
Olivier Reuland	134.15	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the HRZ is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Grant Buchan	143.21	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
Braydon White	146.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Wants to see the zone more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Seeks that the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
Jocelyn Brandon	158.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to allow greater intensification in the lower Kelburn area.	Seeks that greater intensification is not enabled in the lower Kelburn area. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in Part	Yes
Jill Ford	163.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
Amos Mann	172.22	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
Patrick Wilkes	173.21	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
Pete Gent	179.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
Dennis Foot	193.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that there are many available sites for intensive high rise housing should be located on Te Aro flat and main transport routes.	Seeks that intensive high density residential housing should be located on Te Aro flat and main transport routes.	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Michael O'Rourke	194.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the Government and main opposition party have mandated MRZ changes to the District Plan to reduce the amount of land zoned for High Density Residential Housing.	Seeks that the amount of land proposed as high density residential outside the CBD and rapid transit hubs, should be decreased.	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Michael O'Rourke	194.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes the amount of land in Newtown zoned as HRZ. Considers that the premise to making most of Newtown high density is that it is 10 minutes walk from the CBD - which is false.	Seeks that the amount of land proposed as high density residential in Newtown, especially more than 10 or 15 minutes from the CBD, should be decreased.	Addressed in Report 1A	Yes
Michael O'Rourke	194.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that HRZ four storey or 21m high buildings will negate most of the liveability rules about outdoor space, glazing, boundaries, sun angle boundary heights and site coverage. Considers that we need to minimise the spread of individual high rise building pockets. [Inferred reason given].	Seeks that high rise buildings are concentrated in zones already high (the CBD and faded warehouse spine in lower Adelaide Road).	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Michael O'Rourke	194.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that HRZ buildings will require non-renewable materials, result in total de-vegetation of sites, and no requirement for an outdoor space to dry washing means that dryers will be needed all year round.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Michael O'Rourke	194.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that HRZ buildings will cause shading issues and unhealthy homes for those living to the south of these monoliths.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Michael O'Rourke	194.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that HRZ buildings will steal the investment of those who have installed solar panels on their roof.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Michael O'Rourke	194.15	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that replacing existing homes with HRZ studios, one to two bedroom apartments, can drive families out of neighbourhoods. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Peter Nunns	196.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Andrew Flanagan	198.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that given the very real possibility of a developer building a six-storey high residential only one metre from the property boundary, the submitter asks how will WCC compensate neighbouring properties.	Seeks that the Council clarifies how it will compensate neighbouring properties of six-storey developments for the loss of light, privacy, increased noise, and investments that depend on sunshine hours.	Reject	No
Kim McGuiness, Andrew Cameron, Simon Bachler, Deb Hendry, Penny Evans, Stephen Evens, David Wilcox, Mary Vaughan Roberts, Siva Naguleswaran, Mohammed Talim, Ben Sutherland, Atul Patel, Lewis Roney Yip, Sarah Collier Jaggard	204.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes the area between Adelaide Road, Stoke Street and Kenwyn Terrace being zoned as High Density Residential Zone.	Seeks that the area between Adelaide Road, Stoke Street and Kenwyn Terrace is all zoned as Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept	Yes
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	F568.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	Not specified.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Russell Taylor	224.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Remove the High Density Residential Zone from the south side hillside of Aro Valley.	Accept	Yes
Keith Clement	231.1	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the NPS-UD which is flawed in the it fails to address local circumstance, history, nuance and need. Zoning by height is incompatible and indeed contradictory to the many controls employed over the last fifty years. The HRZ (21m) is at odds with the fine grained largely low rise existing in central city Character Areas. The use of this control requires to be set aside for reconsideration. A 45degree SAP from a 21m high building will cast a shadow to the footpath on the opposite side of the street, all year. This is negative to the public space and amenity and would mean that when the area is fully redeveloped under this proposed control the entire length of the street will be in shade for most of the day, all year. Six storey buildings are a lot more expensive to build (concrete and steel) and operate (lifts and BA Schedule systems) than walk-up town-houses. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the PDP replaces the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) with MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) wherever possible. [Inferred decision requested]	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Richard W Keller	232.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that a standard is added requiring that developments adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No
Richard W Keller	232.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that universal accessibility is required for all residential development in the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone).	Reject	No
Richard W Keller	232.21	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) is amended to be more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the HRZ is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
Regan Dooley	239.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it, with universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ (High density residential zone) developments should adequately accommodate active and public transport as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it, with universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama, and therefore a separate definition of "supported residential care activities" is unnecessary.	Remove the references to "supported residential care activity" from the High Density Residential zone.	Accept.	Yes.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.8	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the deletion of this definition as it is uncertain how the deletion of the definition would affect existing activities that fall within this definition.	Disallow	Reject	Yes
Pauletta Wilson	257.4	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes the Mt Cook area being zoned as High Density Residential Zone.	Seeks that the Mt Cook Area be rezoned as Medium Density Residential Zone with the 11m Height Control Area.	Accept in Part	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.142	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers the introduction to the chapter needs to be amended to include reference to inundation areas as a qualifying matter.	Amend paragraph 5 of the High Density Residential Zone Introduction as follows: • Stream corridors, and overland flow paths and inundation areas (refer to Natural Hazards Chapter). Note – for changes to the HRZ chapter, refer to the attached annotated version of the chapter.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.106	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission, noting that inundation areas are managed by other rules so therefore do not necessarily need to be included as qualifying matters.	Disallow	Accept	No
Mary Sullivan	277.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes High Density Residential Zoning in the Prospect Terrace, Woodland Road, and the up-hill section of Frankmoore Avenue area. Considers that the area includes areas which are difficult to access on foot by most people, particularly elderly and people with young children or disabilities. Some of the area zoned as High density is up steep hills, with narrow roads, and have either no footpaths or footpaths on one side only. They are not therefore suitable for high density developments.	Opposes High Density Residential Zoning in the Prospect Terrace, Woodland Road, and the up-hill section of Frankmoore Avenue area.	Accept in Part	Yes
Eldin Family Trust	287.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes zoning of Selwyn Terrace (and the nearby areas of Hill Street and Guildford Terrace) in the High Density Residential Zone (as alternative to City Centre Zone) due to the height limits this would permit. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Opposes zoning of Selwyn Terrace (and the nearby areas of Hill Street and Guildford Terrace) in the High Density Residential Zone (as alternative to City Centre Zone). [Inferred decision requested]	Addressed in Report 4B	
Priscilla Williams	293.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers that the hilly terrain makes this area unsuitable for high rise building.	Opposes the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) that spans across Wesley Road, Aurora Terrace and Bolton Street. [Inferred Decision Requested]	Accept in Part	Yes
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.42	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose in part	Considers that HRZ standards should be amended to require cycle and micromobility parking and charging for residents that is sufficient to meet future demand aligned with 80% of people making some trips per week by cycle. Multi-unit housing should provide adequate and appropriately located cycle and micromobility parking that meets the standards set out in the Transport chapter of the PDP.	Opposes standards in the 'High Density Residential Zone' chapter and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.200	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	The RVA does not oppose these submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, the RVA considers that the changes sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages form the application of the new provisions.	Accept	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.200	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	69.56	Amend / Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages form the application of the new provisions.	Accept	No
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.43	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ standards should be amended to require cycle and micromobility parking and charging for residents that is sufficient to meet future demand aligned with 80% of people making some trips per week by cycle. Multi-unit housing should provide adequate and appropriately located cycle and micromobility parking that meets the standards set out in the Transport chapter of the PDP.	Amend standards in the 'High Density Residential Zone' chapter to require cycle and micromobility parking and charging for residents that is sufficient to meet future demand aligned with 80% of people making some trips per week by cycle.	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.201	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	The RVA does not oppose these submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, the RVA considers that the changes sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages form the application of the new provisions.	Accept	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.201	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Ryman does not oppose these submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, Ryman considers that the changes sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages form the application of the new provisions.	Accept	No
Roland Sapsford	305.46	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that the 10 minute walkable catchments have resulted in parts of Aro Valley being zoned HRZ, when this is not appropriate for this suburb. [Refer to original submission for details]	Seeks that further consideration is given to the unique characteristics of Aro Valley. [Inferred decision sought]	Accept in Part	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Roland Sapsford	305.47	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the site to the North of Aro Park being zoned HRZ allows development of a 6-storey building which would significantly reduce daytime sunlight on the park in the cooler months of the year.	Seeks that the site to the north of Aro Park not be classified as High Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	Yes
Roland Sapsford	305.48	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the District Plan should better identify and protect areas of existing green space from partial or complete loss within High Density Residential Zones.	Seeks that the District Plan be amended to better identify and protect areas of existing green space from partial or complete loss within High Density Residential Zones.	Reject	No
Roland Sapsford	305.49	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that six-storey buildings should not be allowed on Aro Street. Most of Aro Street, as well as Adams Terrace and lower Durham Street, are zoned for at least six storeys, with the exception of some heritage-listed buildings. While six storeys may be appropriate for structures tucked into the escarpment below Landcross Street or Durham Street, one poorly-placed building fronting Aro Street could have catastrophic effects on winter sunlight for many dwellings, including a large amount of recent infill housing.	Seeks that all High Density Residential Zones be removed from Aro Street. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in Part	Yes
Roland Sapsford	305.50	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that six-storey buildings should not be allowed on Aro Street. Most of Aro Street, as well as Adams Terrace and lower Durham Street, are zoned for at least six storeys, with the exception of some heritage-listed buildings. While six storeys may be appropriate for structures tucked into the escarpment below Landcross Street or Durham Street, one poorly-placed building fronting Aro Street could have catastrophic effects on winter sunlight for many dwellings, including a large amount of recent infill housing.	Seeks that all High Density Residential Zones fronting Aro Street be removed from Durham Street. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	Yes
Roland Sapsford	305.51	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to High Density Residential area need modification so as to provide a far more nuanced and careful consideration of issues such as light, shading, wind, privacy, design quality, retention of green areas, character and heritage.	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to provide more careful consideration to issues such as light, shading, wind, privacy, design quality, retention of green areas, character and heritage.	Reject	No
Roland Sapsford	305.52	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to High Density Residential area need modification so as to provide for enhanced sunlight access to outdoor and indoor living areas, the addition and extension of new green space to balance increased residential densities, and take a more sophisticated and nuanced approach to design guidance.	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to provide for enhanced sunlight access to outdoor and indoor living areas, the addition and extension of new green space to balance increased residential densities, and take a more sophisticated and nuanced approach to design guidance.	Reject	No
Roland Sapsford	305.53	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the vacant site North of 95A Aro Street being zoned HRZ would cause loss of sunlight and negative impacts on the wellbeing of residents of the Argo Trust. The Argo Trust provides a residential and vocational service for six men and women with profound physical and intellectual disabilities. Permanent residents of the Argo Trust have north-facing bedrooms overlooking the vacant site. The vacant site will be zoned for at least six storeys and may cast shade across their home and external spaces.	Seeks that 95 Aro Street not be classified as High Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	Yes
Roland Sapsford	305.54	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that properties immediately to the East of 95A Aro Street being zoned HRZ would cause loss of sunlight and negative impacts on the wellbeing of residents of the Argo Trust. The Argo Trust provides a residential and vocational service for six men and women with profound physical and intellectual disabilities. Permanent residents of the Argo Trust have north-facing bedrooms overlooking the vacant site. The vacant site will be zoned for at least six storeys and may cast shade across their home and external spaces.	Seeks that properties immediately to the East of 95A Aro Street not be classified as High Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	Yes
Roland Sapsford	305.55	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to High Density Residential area need modification so as to retain the capacity within Aro Valley for site-by-site consideration of each development by ensuring that most developments triggers the need for a resource consent, as is currently the case.	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to require resource consents for new developments in Aro Valley.	Reject	No
Roland Sapsford	305.56	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to High Density Residential area need modification so as to develop location specific design guides and relevant standards to enable a more granular approach to local character. Standards should include access to sunlight and shade, the maintenance of personal privacy, the variety and location of green spaces, the location and scale of exterior space and development, the control of heat island effects and the look and feel of the streets we inhabit.	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to include location specific design guides and standards to enable a more granular approach to local character.	Reject	No
Roland Sapsford	305.57	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone standards for height limit, site coverage, height in relation to boundary and side and rear yard setbacks so as to require resource consents where new developments have a more than minor impact on local character, sunlight, shading and outdoor recreation space.	Reject	No
Roland Sapsford	305.58	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to require resource consents related to the location of buildings on sites and issues of personal privacy and shading within and between multiple developments on a single site so to enable management of these design quality issues.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Roland Sapsford	305.59	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to High Density Residential area need modification so as to retain existing provisions relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan rather than replace them with the minimum daylight provisions of the proposed Plan.	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to retain existing provisions relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan.	Reject	No
Roland Sapsford	305.60	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to identify underutilised sites and locations within Aro Valley that are not subject to demolition controls and are suitable for intensification within the existing character areas (as defined in the Operative Plan).	Reject	No
Roland Sapsford	305.61	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to identify sites and areas within Aro Valley where more intensive development could occur without adverse effects on sunlight, privacy, heritage and local character.	Reject	No
Roland Sapsford	305.62	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that objectives and rules relating to the HRZ chapter as they relate to Aro valley should clearly identify community-based planning for intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to the revised demolition controls set out above, and provide for this planning to occur so as to be complete prior to significant infrastructure investment.	Seeks that community-based planning be identified prior to infrastructure investments in the High Density Residential chapter.	Reject	No
Svend Heeselohlt Henne Hansen	308.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No
Svend Heeselohlt Henne Hansen	308.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Wants to see the zone more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
Lisa Nickson, Garrick Northover and Warren Sakey	313.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers that HRZ developments will create civil disobedience in the area.	Opposes zoning of Aro Street as High Density Residential Zone.	Accept in Part	Yes
Lisa Nickson, Garrick Northover and Warren Sakey	313.4	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the inclusion of Aro Street in the high density residential zone will achieve the opposite of a healthy, safe, and attractive living environment, and in fact undermine those objectives in this area.	Seeks that Aro Street not be zoned a High Density Residential Zone.	Accept in Part	Yes
Penelope Borland	317.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that Mount Victoria should not be zoned HRZ, as 6-storey intensification is too much for Mt. Victoria. High density in this area will adversely affect the liveability and sense of place of both Mount Victoria and Wellington's overall identity. High density in Mount Victoria is also unnecessary for housing capacity and will lead to the loss of valuable historic heritage and character that is a part of the city's story and identity.	Seeks that Mount Victoria not be zoned High Density Residential Zone.	Accept in Part	Yes
Penelope Borland	317.21	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that a 21m building at the top of Majoribanks Street, on Hawker, Earl's Terrace or Stafford Street would negatively impact light for many neighbours, have dramatic wind effects in extreme wind zones, massively impact the neighbourhood character, and stretch constrained infrastructure including roads, parking and other amenities.	Seeks that Majoribanks Street, Hawker, Earl's Terrace and Stafford Street not have 21m building height limits.	Accept in Part	Yes
Richard Murcott	322.24	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers that the Housing and Business Land Capacity Assessment established that the demand was for 2-3 storey townhouses, not 6 storey blocks. The greatest unmet demand overall in the city will be in terrace housing, which makes 6-storey zoning in the city unnecessary.	Opposes 6-storey housing developments under High Density Residential Zoning in the inner city.	Accept in Part	Yes
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.56	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow	Accept in Part	Yes
Richard Murcott	322.25	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that wind should be included as a qualifying matter, rule or standard to address any hazard/safety issues that can arise from 6-storey or higher developments. Wind can have adverse impacts on adjacent areas, properties and streets, which should be avoided. Such rules may be particularly pertinent in transition areas between low-rise zones and more permissive height zones, such as the Thorndon flat. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that wind be taken into account as a potential safety hazard linked with High Density Residential Zone developments.	Addressed in Stream 5	
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.57	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow	Addressed in Stream 5	
Khoi Phan	326.29	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the inner suburb of Mt Victoria, Mt Cook, Te Aro and Kelburn should be classified as High Density Residential Zones.	Seeks that Mt Victoria, Mt Cook, Te Aro and Kelburn be classified as High Density Residential Zones.	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that six-storey development in Mount Cook should be focused along the semi-industrial zones near Adelaide Road and in the Arlington to Hankey Street block abutting the City Centre Zone, as these sites are well suited to high-density development.	Seeks that High Density Residential Zones in Mount Cook be localised along the semi-industrial zones near Adelaide Road and in the Arlington to Hankey Street block abutting the City Centre Zone.	Addressed in Report 1A	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.101	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission as this not consistent with the outcomes sought by the NPS-UD.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.15	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that multi-unit dwellings are an important aspect of Mt Cook and should have strong environmental and sustainable living provisions. In particular, the impacts of living more sustainably in apartments needs to incorporate provision for waste management such as composting, emergency provisions such as water storage, and access to green spaces and common areas for wellbeing, mental health and dog-walking. Rooftop gardens, pocket parks, well-designed foyers and hallways provide spaces for informal interaction which are important for living well together in an apartment community.	Seeks that provisions on sustainable living be created for multi-unit dwellings in Mount Cook.	Reject	No
Tina Reid	341.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Support the majority of the Mt Cook area as high density would destroy the pre-1930 character of the area, and believe that intensification of housing can happen in much more harmonious ways.	Seeks that the majority of Mt Cook area not be zoned High Density Residential Zone.	Accept in Part	Yes
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.27	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that four to six-storey buildings in Mount Victoria, aside from Kent Terrace, will be out of scale with the surrounding dwellings. These areas should be redefined for residential and business purposes.	Seeks that Mount Victoria be rezoned from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept in Part	Yes
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.256	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support in part	Supports well-planned intensification within the existing urban footprint in appropriate areas that are not subject to a qualifying matter. This approach is consistent with Policy 31 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain chapter, subject to amendments, as outlined in other submission points.	Accept in part	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.257	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that for the provisions of the zone to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1. This includes (but is not limited to) urban areas that are climate resilient, contribute to the protection of the natural environment and transition to a low-emission region, are compact and well connected, support housing affordability and choice, and enable Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms.	Seeks to ensure the Medium Density Residential Zone provisions have regard to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1, by including necessary objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that provide for these qualities and characteristics.	Reject	No
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the need for affordable housing will not be met by demolishing well-functioning pre-1930s inner suburban housing and replacing it with 6-storey apartment blocks. Considers that this will rip apart the fabric of established neighbourhoods, while severely disrupting the lives of many who will no longer be able to afford to live there or whose homes are downgraded. Considers that developers and wealthy property investors will maximise their profits by building luxurious rental complexes at the expense of residents. Notes that this has happened overseas. The submitter states that he goal should be to strengthen the cohesion of the whole community by providing sufficient well-designed and affordable and social housing in the many underdeveloped and derelict areas of the city and its near surrounds. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that more well-designed affordable and social housing be provided in the many underdeveloped and derelict areas of the city and its near surrounds	Reject	No
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that high density housing in inner suburbs should be reduced and re-assessed. Notes that the recent Housing and Business Land Capacity Assessment (HBA) Update undermines the need to expose quality older homes to the random threat of demolition. The submitter understands that the report concluded that Wellington's capacity was already in place in the earlier District Plan to meet the inner-city demand for apartment buildings until 2051. The demand, as described in this Report, is for low-rise town houses which is entirely compatible with retaining the older inner-city houses of our city.	Seeks that High Density Residential Zones be reduced and re-assessed according to the Housing and Business Land Capacity Assessment (HBA).	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that high rise apartment blocks in inner suburbs should be carefully selected. These buildings must be well regulated and subject to rules that avoid increasing the risks of dampness, cold, lack of sunshine and lack of privacy in adjacent homes. They should not be zoned in broad-bush areas. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Seeks that High Density Residential Zones in inner suburbs be carefully and appropriately selected.	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that Character Housing and Areas should be listed as Qualifying Matters limiting 6-storey heights in High Density Residential Zones.	Seeks that character be a qualifying matter in High Density Residential Zones.	Addressed in Report 2B	
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.93	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 2B	
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that sunshine access and privacy should be considered as Qualifying Matters when considering the suitability of sites for 6-story blocks.	Seeks that sunshine and privacy be treated as Qualifying Matters in High Density Residential Zones.	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.94	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Z Energy Limited	361.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support in part	The HRZ chapter is partially supported, granted HRZ-P6 (Multi unit housing) is amended to require consideration of reverse sensitivity effects. This policies i a matter of discretion for multi-unit housing (i.e. more than 3 dwellings per site) in the HRZ.	Retain the High Density Residential Zone chapter with amendment.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.154	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought relating to recognition of reverse sensitivity in policies and matters of discretion due to potential impacts on residential intensification.	Disallow	Accept	No
Josephine Brien / Tim Bollinger	365.4	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the High Density zoning of all addresses adjacent to the open Community Centre grounds and the community recreational area on Aro Street is inappropriate for the requirements of this well-used inner city community area, that includes a basket ball court and a pedestrian cycle access way through the park to the top of Palmer street and into Wellington city. This is most likely an accident and should be corrected, as sunlight needs to reach the park.	Seeks that properties on Palmer street adjacent to the Aro Valley Cottages Heritage Area be rezoned from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept in Part	Yes
Waka Kotahi	370.323	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers he NPS-UD requires councils to enable buildings of at least 6 storeys within at least a walkable catchment of existing and planned rapid transit stops, the edge of city centre zones, and the edge of metropolitan centre zones, with building heights and densities of urban form commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services in other centre zones. As many centres as possible should be up-zoned to the fullest extent possible to provide for local services for people who will be living in the walkable catchments. [See original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that the provisions in the High Density residential zone should be amended to enable higher densities to better align with the NPS-UD. Recommend that greater building heights are enabled – to provide for densities that are commensurate to the services available. Waka Kotahi considers this is best determined by an assessment undertaken by Wellington Council to determine what densities are commensurate in different areas across the district, or otherwise the following maximum building heights are included: - Maximum of six storeys in a walkable catchment of local centre zones - Maximum of twelve storeys in a walkable catchment of city centre, metropolitan centre zones and within a walkable catchment of existing and planned rapid transit stops.	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.145	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers the proposed increases in heights are more enabling than NPS-UD requirements without justification.	Disallow	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.21	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the enabling of higher densities within the High Density residential zone and greater building heights, to the extent consistent with Kāinga Ora primary submission. Kāinga Ora supports subsequent and associated submission points from Waka Kotahi in respect of increased density and greater building heights.	Allow / Seeks that the submission is allowed where it is consistent with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Reject	No
LIVE WELLington	FS96.90	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Proposed increases in heights are more enabling than NPS-UD requirements without justification.	Disallow	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.324	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support in part	Supports the direction to enable a range of housing types and densities in the High Density residential zone.	Retain the High Density Residential Zone, with amendments.	Accept in part	No
Waka Kotahi	370.325	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that enabling up to twelve stories is appropriate in certain areas where the density is supported by services.	Amend the High Density Residential Zone chapter as follows: The High Density Residential Zone provides for a range of housing types at a greater density and scale than the Medium Density Residential Zone. It gives effect to the requirements of the RMA to allow for three residential units of up to three storeys on a site, and also by enabling multi-unit housing of up to six <u>twelve</u> storeys in appropriate areas through a resource consent process subject to standards and design guidance.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.326	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S4 should have immediate legal effect to align with the MDRS requirements, and to avoid confusion where boundary setbacks are applied from both the operative and district plan. It is noted the intention of the NPS-UD is to enable urban environments to evolve and change, enabled by the national standards.	[Inferred decision requested] Seeks that all that relate to HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) have immediate legal effect.	Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.128	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support in part	The HRZ chapter is generally supported. As it stands, the PDP will enable the construction and use of three dwellings on most residential properties, with a maximum height of 11m and more permissive building recession planes, as a permitted activity. In addition, resource consents may be obtained as a restricted discretionary activity to construct buildings up to 25m in height with no limit to the number of residential units (i.e.: density). The submitters considers these greater residential densities and more permissive building standards are likely to generate greater potential for reverse sensitivity effects that may affect the ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade of their facilities which are a physical resource that must be managed under the Act.	Retain the HRZ (high density residential zone) chapter, with amendment to HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing).	Reject	No
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the HRZ (High density residential zone) is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.432	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the High Density Residential Zone should apply to areas that extend: i. 15-20min/1500m walkable catchment from the edge of the City Centre Zone ii. 15min/800m walkable catchment from the edge of MCZ and from existing and planned rapid transit stops (including the Johnsonville Line) iii. 10 min/400-800m walkable catchment from Town Centre Zones. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including Appendix 4]	Seeks that High Density Residential Zones extend: i. 15-20min/1500m walkable catchment from the edge of the City Centre Zone ii. 15min/800m walkable catchment from the edge of MCZ and from existing and planned rapid transit stops (including the Johnsonville Line) iii. 10 min/400-800m walkable catchment from Town Centre Zones. [Refer to original submission, Appendix 4 for proposed walkable catchment mapping]	Addressed in Report 1A	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.23	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers the proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Medium Density Residential Standards and would enable an unjustified level of development. Considers there is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary. Considers original submission contains the submitter's view of appropriate settings for our community. [Refer to original submission - 283]	Disallow	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.112	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers the submission point is more enabling of intensification than the NPS-UD and MDRS and is not justified.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.73	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Addressed in Report 1A	No
LIVE WELLington	FS96.32	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	We oppose changes to introduce new high density provisions as these are not required to deliver the capacity required and will have significant impact on the amenity and liveability of residential areas.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Roland Sapsford	FS117.31	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	We oppose changes to introduce new high density provisions as these are not required to deliver the capacity required and will have significant impact on the amenity and liveability of residential areas.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.433	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support in part	The Introduction of the High Density Residential Zone in the Proposed District Plan is supported, but amendments consistent with the spatial extent and heights are sought.	Retain the Introduction of the High Density Residential Zone with amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.434	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that the Introduction of the High Density Residential Zone should be amended.	Amend the Introduction of the High Density Residential Zone as follows: he High Density Residential Zone encompasses areas of the city located near to the City Centre Zone, Johnsonville City Centre Zone, Metropolitan Centre Zones, Town Centre Zones and Kenepepe and Tawa railway stations. These areas are used predominantly for residential activities with a high concentration and bulk of buildings and other compatible activities. ... The High Density Residential Zone provides for a range of housing types at a greater density and scale than the Medium Density Residential Zone. It gives effect to the requirements of the RMA to provide for well functioning urban environments by allowing for three intensive development residential units of up to 6 storeys in all areas of the HRZ and up to 12 storeys in areas of high accessibility to key centres, three storeys on a site, and also by enabling multi-unit housing of up to six storeys through a resource consent process subject to standards and design guidance. ...	Accept in part	Yes
Pukepueke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.18	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow	Reject	No
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes elements of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow	Reject	No
Don MacKay	FS94.18	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow	Reject	No
LIVE WELLington	FS96.33	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Changes to high density residential zone approach is opposed. These are not required to deliver the capacity required and will have significant impact on the amenity and liveability of residential areas	Disallow	Reject	No
Roland Sapsford	FS117.32	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Changes to high density residential zone approach is opposed. These are not required to deliver the capacity required and will have significant impact on the amenity and liveability of residential areas.	Disallow	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the HRZ is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
David Cadman	398.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the HRZ is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.88	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes extent of High Density Residential Zone in Mount Victoria. The areas to the south of Vogel Street are predominantly high density zone in the plan except for small character areas. Submitter considers that that the Earls Terrace and Port Street/Stafford Street area has qualities, including visibility which should qualify it as a character area. The submitter considers that Earls Terrace and Port Street/Stafford Street area has a particularly charming ambience and modification to the houses has generally been in keeping with the Mt Victoria architecture.	Remove High Density Residential Zone from Earls Terrace, Port Street and Stafford Street area.	Accept in Part.	Yes
Investore Property Limited	405.52	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	Supports the provision of six storey residential development in the wider Johnsonville catchment.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Investore Property Limited	405.53	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	Supports the provision of a broad area of six storey High Density Residential zoning in the wider Johnsonville catchment. Submitter considers that this gives effect to the NPS-UD and reflects the status of Johnsonville as a Metropolitan Centre.	Retain the provision for six storey high density zoning within the wider Johnsonville catchment as notified.	Accept in Part.	No
Investore Property Limited	405.54	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers that the exclusion of the Johnsonville rail line from "rapid transit" and high density residential zoning within catchments of a train station is inappropriate and inconsistent with the NPS-UD, Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan and Change 1 to the Wellington Regional Policy Statement. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes the exclusion of the walkable catchments of the Johnsonville rail line from the High Density Residential Zone. Seeks that the Johnsonville train line is identified as rapid transit and high density residential zoning applies in accordance with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Johnsonville Community Association Inc	FS114.25	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be "frequent" and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services. Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi. In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service. Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Disallow / Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).	Addressed in Report 1A.	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.120	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers the Proposed Plan does not recognise rail as a qualifying matter. KiwiRail seeks that the railway corridor be identified as a qualifying matter and be applied to impose building setback requirements from the rail boundary.</p> <p>The High Density Residential Zone adjoins the rail corridor in several suburbs in Wellington City, including Johnsonville, Tawa and Keneperu. KiwiRail support urban development, including around transport nodes, and recognises the benefits of co-locating housing near transport corridors.</p> <p>However, it is critical that the Proposed Plan provides for adequate management of the interface between urban development and lawfully established, critical infrastructure, such as the railway network. This is necessary to ensure our communities are built in healthy living environments, and the railway network can operate and develop in the future without constraint. An integrated and proactive approach to planning is critical to support the overall vision of our urban environments, and to ensure that our transport network can support the increasing growth and housing intensification.</p> <p>The nature of railway operations means KiwiRail cannot fully internalise all its effects within the railway corridor boundaries. Environmental legislation and caselaw recognises the lawful emission of such effects. Increasing development around railway corridors consequentially means the introduction of more sensitive receivers to adverse effects of existing and lawful railway activities. With a likely increase in sensitive activities forecast to locate in proximity to the railway corridor as a result of the Amendment Act, KiwiRail is concerned that without appropriate planning measures in place at a territorial level, the risk of adverse health and amenity effects impacting people locating in proximity to the railway corridor, and reverse sensitivity effects constraining our operations is significantly elevated.</p> <p>For this reason, it is essential that the Proposed Plan appropriately manages the development of new sensitive activities in proximity to the railway corridor.</p>	<p>Amend the HRZ Introduction as follows:</p> <p>There are parts of the High Density Residential Zone where the permitted development, height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters. These include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stream corridors and overland flow paths (refer to Natural Hazards Chapter); Heritage buildings, heritage structures and heritage areas (refer to Historic Heritage Chapter); Notable trees (refer to Notable Trees Chapter); and Sites and areas of significance to Māori (refer to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Chapter). <p><u>Railway corridor (building set back from rail boundary); (refer to HRZ-S4).</u></p>	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	F589.28	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes changes to provisions and rules relating to the rail corridor as a qualifying matter in KiwiRail's submission.	Disallow	Accept	No
Emma Osborne	410.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.72	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Submitter notes the effect that the more permissive medium density residential standards will have on other zones. The zones supporting higher density development have more restrictive standards than in the MRZ, creating a risk that new development is concentrated in the more permissive MRZ at the exclusion of denser zones where Council wishes to encourage greater development. The PDP should ensure that the restrictions within denser zones are not substantially more restrictive than within the MRZ [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that Council consider the relationship between the Medium Density Residential Zone and denser zones (i.e. the High Density Residential Zone, Large Lot Residential Zone, Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre one, Commercial Zone, Mixed Use Zone, Metropolitan Centre Zone and City Centre Zone) to ensure development is not unduly restricted in denser zones by greater restrictions and Council discretion.	Reject	No
Luke Stewart	422.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
Johnsonville Community Association	429.33	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Supports medium density residential standards as they allow 3 dwellings up to 3 storeys in height in all residential zones. This would enable higher levels of development than is currently proposed in the Draft District Plan in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential Zones	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Johnsonville Community Association	429.34	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that Johnsonville East should not be in the HDRZ.</p> <p>The Johnsonville Walkable Catchment testing report says that walking network model does not account for the quality or perceived safety of walking routes and pathways.</p> <p>MfE guidance on NPS-UD leaves walking catchment size and "Path quality" up to local councils but does recommend that certain factors are taken into account when determining walking catchment (Full reference in original submission).</p> <p>Considers that Johnsonville East (Map on original submission) should be excluded from High Density Residential Zone on the basis that it has poor pedestrian access, inconsistency with MfE recommended factors, it's accessible via steps, and that in 2013 the Environment Court rejected the claim that Johnsonville East was walkable accessible and WCC agreed to remove it from MDRA.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Oposes High Density Residential Zoning in Johnsonville East (Area A on original submission map, page 25).</p> <p>[Inferred Decision Requested]</p>	Accept in Part.	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Johnsonville Community Association	429.35	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that Middleton Road should not be in the HDRZ.</p> <p>The Johnsonville Walkable Catchment testing report says that walking network model does not account for the quality or perceived safety of walking routes and pathways.</p> <p>MfE guidance on NPS-UD leaves walking catchment size and "Path quality" up to local councils but does recommend that certain factors are taken into account when determining walking catchment (Full reference in original submission).</p> <p>Considers that Middleton Road area (Map on original submission page 25) is excluded from High Density Residential Zoning because it is not walking accessible. Middleton Road area has a busy arterial road with limited crossing areas, is inconsistent with many of the MfE factors, and that in 2013 Environment Court rejected WCC claim that the area was walking accessible and it was removed from MDRA.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Opposes High Density Residential Zoning in Middleton Road (Area B on original submission map, page 25).</p> <p>[Inferred Decision Requested]</p>	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Johnsonville Community Association	429.36	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that Woodland Road/Prospect Terrace should not be in the HDRZ.</p> <p>The Johnsonville Walkable Catchment testing report says that walking network model does not account for the quality or perceived safety of walking routes and pathways.</p> <p>MfE guidance on NPS-UD leaves walking catchment size and "Path quality" up to local councils but does recommend that certain factors are taken into account when determining walking catchment (Full reference in original submission).</p> <p>Considers that Woodland Road/Prospect Terrace is not walking accessible, as it requires walking on a steep and narrow road. It is inconsistent with many of the MfE factors. High rise along this ridge will also have an impact on visual amenity.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Opposes High Density Residential Zoning in Woodland Road/Prospect Terrace (Area C on original submission map, page 25).</p> <p>[Inferred Decision Requested]</p>	Accept	Yes
Johnsonville Community Association	429.37	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that Cortina Avenue should not be in the HDRZ.</p> <p>The Johnsonville Walkable Catchment testing report says that walking network model does not account for the quality or perceived safety of walking routes and pathways.</p> <p>MfE guidance on NPS-UD leaves walking catchment size and "Path quality" up to local councils but does recommend that certain factors are taken into account when determining walking catchment (Full reference in original submission).</p> <p>Considers that Cortina Avenue is beyond the 10 minute walking catchment, the central government medium density standards will render the special zoning in the PDP no longer relevant.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Opposes High Density Residential Zoning in Cortina Avenue (Area D on original submission map, page 25).</p> <p>[Inferred Decision Requested]</p>	Accept	Yes
Miriam Moore	433.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that housing along more accessible routes is essential in Wellington where terrain is a constant challenge to accessibility. Public transport users are likely to walk further for trains, and having an efficient bus service as a faster option should not lessen a train line's suitability as an MRT line, but enhance it.</p>	Seeks to include high density along Mass Rapid Transit	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Miriam Moore	433.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that Council should be active in looking for acquisition opportunities for more small and functional parks in the HRZ. Smaller yards and smaller homes need to be brought in hand-in-hand with more spaces for people of all ages and abilities to spend time outside.</p>	Seeks more green spaces within the High Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No
Miriam Moore	433.15	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers the HRZ provisions should be more enabling provisions of small-scale public commercial activities like corner stores/coffee shops to help keep these areas convenient and active, subject to matters of discretion.</p>	Seek that more public and private community activities are enabled as a Discretionary Restricted activity within the High Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No
Michelle Rush	436.15	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the HRZ should be revised to reflect the walking catchments of the Johnsonville line as a rapid transit route. All other consequential amendments to the plan's sections should also be made to give effect to this.</p>	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone be revised to reflect the walking catchments of the Johnsonville Line as a Rapid Transit Line	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Michelle Rush	436.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	<p>Objectives in the HRZ chapter are supported as they balance the need for intensification with environmental safeguards.</p>	Retain Objectives in the High Density Residential Zone chapter as notified.	Reject	No
Kirsty Woods	437.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Opposes the High Density Residential zoning for suburban Newtown. High density zoning in this area fails to address effects adequately, including loss of sunlight, adverse effects associated with demolition and rebuilding and loss of green spaces. Considers that there is an excess of housing provided through the proposed district plan above what is required. By creating much larger areas to enable 6 storey buildings than is likely to be required, the council is promoting unnecessary adverse effects on existing housing. Considers that the alternative extent provided in the Red Design Architects submission is more appropriate.</p>	Seeks that High Density Zoning in Newtown is limited to the extent indicated in the Red Design Architects and Newtown Residents Association submissions. Seeks that all other areas are rezoned as Medium Density Residential.	Accept in Part	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Newtown Residents' Association	440.25	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that Newtown's residential streets outside the suburban centre should be classified as MRZ. In particular the zoning of several blocks around the Newtown suburban centre for heights of up to 21m seems unnecessary and counter productive to maintaining a well functioning urban environment. Allowing 6-storey development blocks in low-rise residential areas would have damaging effects on the value of neighbouring houses. Furthermore, combining terraced homes, typically of 3 storeys, with 6 storey apartment blocks doesn't give good results unless the sites are carefully planned.	Seeks that Newtown's residential streets outside the suburban centre be rezoned as Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept in Part	Yes
Kathryn Lethbridge	442.4	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes the High Density Residential Zoning of the Hobson Precinct (between Murphy Street and Hobson Street/Davis Street and the motorway) and considers that this should be rezoned as MRZ. Considers that MRZ for the Hobson Precinct meets the Government requirements for development and is more appropriate given the existing nature of the area and potential for inappropriate development.	Opposes the zoning of the Hobson Precinct (between Murphy Street and Hobson Street/Davis Street and the motorway) as High Density Residential Zone.	Accept in Part.	Yes
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.72	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	WCC summary reads: The zone is a jewel in the Wellington character / heritage crown and appropriate houses in the area should be protected to prevent unnecessary loss to this key cultural asset for the city. Considers that MRZ for the Hobson Precinct meets the Government requirements for development and is more appropriate given the existing nature of the area and potential for inappropriate development.	Allow	Accept in Part.	Yes
Kay Larsen	447.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers that the make up of the area is already dense enough to be considered High-Density. Considers that the terrace is too small to accommodate further traffic from high density development. Considers that the infrastructure on TheTerrace South is insufficient for further development. Considers that the hillside is steep and innappropriate for 6 storey development. Considers that there are many pathways, shortcuts, large old trees, housing and Boyd Wilson Sports Field scattered in the area. [See original submission for full reason]	Opposes High Density Residential Zoning in Southern Terrace (Area between Abel Smith Street, Ghuznee Street, Terrace and including St John Street and Abel Smith Street extension).	Accept in Part	Yes
John Wilson	453.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks clarification in relation to zoning around Metropolitan Centre Zones - why High Density Residential rules also apply to the Johnsonville centre compared to the Kilbirnie residential centre. [Inferred decision requested]	Addressed in Report 1A.	No
John Wilson	453.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes the provisions in the Plan relating to "Kenepuru and Tawa railway stations Zone/Zones". [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Delete all provisions related to "Kenepuru and Tawa railway stations Zone/Zones". [Inferred decision requested]	Addressed in Report 1A.	No
John Wilson	453.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Not specified	Considers that there are no definition links from the "High Density residential" page as for the "City Centre Zone", which has a definition of the applicable zone rules.	Seeks that definition links are added to the High Density Residential wording in the introduction of the chapter. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Rachel Underwood	458.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers that under the proposed plan, the character of suburbs like Mt Victoria, Newtown, Island Bay, Kelburn, Thorndon, Aro Valley, parts of Brooklyn, Ngaio is at risk if developers place six-storey blocks. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks to remove provisions relating to six storey requirements. [Inferred decision requested]	Addressed in Report 1A.	No
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	The submitter has concerns on the shading of private properties. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks clarity and stricter standards for shading, recession planes privacy, outlook space and solar access in the High Density residential zones. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Daniel Christopher Murray Grantham	468.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased to a 15 minute walking catchment. [Inferred decision requested].	Addressed in Report 1A.	No
Stride Investment Management Limited	470.22	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Support	Supports the area zoned as High Residential and the associated six storey allowance in the wider Johnsonville catchment.	Retain the High Density Residential Zoning (21m) in the wider Johnsonville catchment.	Accept in Part	No
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Catherine Penitto	474.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes the HRZ of Arlington Street. Considers that the District Plan encourages a variety of housing types, sizes and tenure which will be lost in Arlington Street without a zone change. CC-03 (Urban form and scale) states that development should be consistent with the strategic goal (5) of a natural environment protected, enhanced and integrated into the urban environment. Without a zone change, the very small reserve at the corner of Arlington and Torrens Terrace, enjoyed by locals for its sunshine, could be overshadowed by high-rise development.	Seeks that the part of Arlington Street currently occupied by privately owned housing should be zoned as General Residential Zone.	Reject	No
Catherine Penitto	474.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Opposes the HRZ of Taranaki Street. Considers that preventing further development on Taranaki Street will enable the opportunity in the future to open up the park to become a more fitting National site for the capital city.	Seeks that no further development takes place on Taranaki Street.	Reject.	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.76	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Concerned that the Residential Design Guide is not given consideration and referred to in any relevant rules for the High Density Residential Zone	Amend appropriate parts of the High Density Residential Zone rules to reflect that they will give effect to Residential Design Guide.	Reject	No
Jonathan Markwick	490.21	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	[Inferred decision requested] Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards.	Reject	No
Jonathan Markwick	490.22	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the High Density Residential Zone is more enabling of small-scale public-facing commercial activities.	Reject	No
Jonathan Markwick	490.23	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that six storey high density residential buildings should be allowed in all of Kelburn (with a viewshaft protection from the top of the cable car) to help accommodate demand for student and staff housing close to Victoria University's Kelburn Campus. Students and staff have extremely high rents with a restricted housing supply in Kelburn.	Seeks that six storey high density residential buildings is allowed in all of Kelburn (with a viewshaft protection from the top of the cable car).	Addressed in Report 3B Accept in Part.	Yes
Jonathan Markwick	490.24	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that six storey high density residential buildings should be allowed in all of Oriental Bay including Hay Street and Grass Street. This suburb is the easiest suburb to walk to from the city centre (from a traffic safety and scenery point of view). Oriental Bay is also the only suburb that is connected to the city centre with a continuous traffic-free cycle path.	Considers that six storey high density residential buildings should be allowed in all of Oriental Bay including Hay Street and Grass Street.	Accept in Part.	Yes
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	F537.24	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers that qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA relating to the specific characteristics of Hay St. Submitters repeats comments made above in relation to Property Council re their opposition to extension of the walkable catchment. Considers that a limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for eg in Hay Street).	Disallow	Accept in Part.	Yes
Don MacKay	F594.24	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Considers that qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA relating to the specific characteristics of Wilkinson Street, particularly its steepness, narrowness, and potentially hazardous nature which make high density intensification inappropriate. Also Don MacKay repeat comments made above in relation to Property Council re their opposition to extension of the walkable catchment.	Disallow	Accept in Part.	Yes
Jonathan Markwick	490.25	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that MRZ-PREC02 (Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct) should be removed to allow for six storey high density residential buildings where SCHED 3 - Heritage Areas do not apply (such as McFarlane Street). Restrictive rules protecting Character Precincts should not be a priority and is morally wrong when we are experiencing a massive shortage of housing and a housing crisis.	Seeks that six storey high density residential buildings are allowed in the areas currently encompassed by the Mount Victoria North Townscape Precinct which do not overlap with SCHED3 - Heritage Areas and that if needed, lower height controls (than six storeys) can be applied for the properties immediately neighbouring St Gerard's.	Reject	No
Jonathan Markwick	490.26	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Considers that restrictive rules protecting Character Precincts should not be a priority and is morally wrong when we are experiencing a massive shortage of housing and a housing crisis).	Seeks that six storey high density residential buildings is allowed in the areas currently encompassed by Mount Victoria Character Precincts which are outside the SCHED3 - Heritage Areas.	Addressed in Report 2B	
Ann Mallinson	F53.6	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	Greater intensification on Oriental Parade and in Hay and Grass Streets is opposed. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responded to the judgment in the submitter's successful legal case D Rendel, A Mallinson & others v Wellington City Council Decision No. W73/98 and provides protection for significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character in Oriental Bay. Refer to original submission 81 (points 81.3 and 81.4).	Disallow	Addressed in Report 2B	

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Denis Foot	FS10.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	The matters of the heights density and planning issues in Oriental Bay were the subject of a very expensive three week hearing at the Environment Court. The case was called Foot v WCC. In that case there were many lawyers, planners, urban designers, architects and residents that gave their views. Judge Kenderdine gave a very carefully considered judgement covering the various areas in Oriental Bay. The decision takes into account the diverse landforms which includes several valleys. There are still many areas in the Oriental Bay area where it is possible to build multi-storey apartments. [Inferred reference to submission point 490.26]	Disallow	Addressed in Report 2B	
Oriental Bay Residents Association	FS13.6	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay. Qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA arising from the topography and specific characteristics of residential side streets, including Hay St and Grass St.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 2B	
Ruapapa Limited	FS18.8	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay. The principles set out in the Environment Court decision in Foot v WCC should remain in place. Qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA arising from the topography and specific characteristics of residential side streets, including Hay St and Grass St. These matters impact the health and safety of Oriental Bay residents.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 2B	
Scott Galloway and Carolyn McLean	FS19.6	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay. Qualifying matters exist under s.79L and s.79 of the RMA arising from the topography and specific characteristics of residential side streets, including Hay St and Grass St. The futher submitter also also refer to and support the media statement of the Insurance Council of New Zealand Inc dated 23 November 2022. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Disallow	Addressed in Report 2B	
Jenny Gyles	F553.6	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay. Considers that qualifying matters exist under s.79L and s.79 of the RMA arising from the topography and specific characteristics of residential side streets, including Hay St and Grass St. Jenny Gyles refers to and support the media statement of the Insurance Council of New Zealand Inc dated 23 November 2022. Considers that the difficulties in obtaining and/or paying for insurance in the future for intensive housing in high hazard zones (especially re earthquake and climate change) and the exposure to hazard of increased infrastructure will be a burden on property owners, taxpayers, ratepayers and residents for many decades to come.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 2B	
Helen Foot	F562.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is extremely important to maintain important townscape and landscape values, and protects public views of Mt Victoria/Matairangi and St Gerards heritage site, and also supports the unique character of Oriental Bay. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct and in particular that part of it adjacent to Hay Street and Grass Street was the subject of a very careful review in the decision of the Environment Court in 1989 (Helen Foot and others v WCC Decision W79/98). There is nothing to be gained by seeking a review of this decision.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 2B	

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
John McSorley and Pierre David	493.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes the high density residential zone building height limit of 21m (or six storeys) for the Lower Kelburn area of Easedale St; Kinross St; Bolton St; Wesley Rd; Aurora Terrace; Clifton Terrace; San Sebastian Rd; Everton Terrace; Onslow Terrace, Talavera Terrace; Clermont Terrace; Salmont Place; Salamanca Road (as far as Kelburn Park), Gladstone Terrace and Rawhiti Terrace near the cable car.</p> <p>The area is difficult and steep terrain which would impeded large scale development.</p> <p>The residential character of one or two-storey housing is a complete contrast with the intense urban development on the other side of the motorway. Limited vehicle traffic contrasts with the developed urban area of the central city and a significant number of pedestrians / cyclists pass through the area.</p> <p>The area has a high degree of green space and provides a sympathetic, appropriate interface with, and approach to, the Botanic Gardens, Norwood Rose Garden, Anderson Park, and the Bolton St Cemetery.</p> <p>Many residences have associations with important people and many of these are in original historic condition.</p> <p>Limited sun hours are available.</p> <p>The area in its present state is an intrinsic element in the character and look of the city itself.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Seeks that a maximum building height of 11m applies in the area encompassing the Lower Kelburn area (Easedale St; Kinross St; Bolton St; Wesley Rd; Aurora Terrace; Clifton Terrace; San Sebastian Rd; Everton Terrace; Onslow Terrace, Talavera Terrace; Clermont Terrace; Salmont Place; Salamanca Road (as far as Kelburn Park), Gladstone Terrace and Rawhiti Terrace near the cable car).</p>	Accept in Part.	Yes
John McSorley and Pierre David	493.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes the building height limit of 21m (or six storeys) for the inner suburbs area of west of Kinross Street and Clifton Terrace, broadly bounded by San Sebastian Road, Wesley Road and Bolton Street.</p> <p>The area is difficult and steep terrain which would impeded large scale development.</p> <p>The residential character of one or two-storey housing is a complete contrast with the intense urban development on the other side of the motorway. Limited vehicle traffic contrasts with the developed urban area of the central city and a significant number of pedestrians/cyclists pass through the area.</p> <p>The area has a high degree of green space and provides a sympathetic, appropriate interface with, and approach to, the Botanic Gardens, Norwood Rose Garden, Anderson Park, and the Bolton St Cemetery.</p> <p>Many residences have associations with important people and many of these are in original historic condition.</p> <p>Limited sun hours are available.</p> <p>The area in its present state is an intrinsic element in the character and look of the city itself.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Seeks that a maximum building height of 11m applies to an areas that encompass west of Kinross Street and Clifton Terrace, broadly bounded by San Sebastian Road, Wesley Road and Bolton Street.</p>	Accept in Part.	Yes
John McSorley and Pierre David	493.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes the building height limit of 21m (or six storeys) for the inner suburbs area broadly centred around Clifton Terrace and Talavera Terrace.</p> <p>The area is difficult and steep terrain which would impeded large scale development.</p> <p>The residential character of one or two-storey housing is a complete contrast with the intense urban development on the other side of the motorway. Limited vehicle traffic contrasts with the developed urban area of the central city and a significant number of pedestrians/cyclists pass through the area.</p> <p>The area has a high degree of green space and provides a sympathetic, appropriate interface with, and approach to, the Botanic Gardens, Norwood Rose Garden, Anderson Park, and the Bolton St Cemetery.</p> <p>Many residences have associations with important people and many of these are in original historic condition.</p> <p>Limited sun hours are available.</p> <p>The area in its present state is an intrinsic element in the character and look of the city itself.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Seeks that a maximum building height of 11m applies to an area encompassing Clifton Terrace and Talavera Terrace..</p>	Accept in Part..	Yes
Zoe Oglivie-Burns	131.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.</p>	<p>Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.</p>	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Anne Uan	132.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No
Ingo Schommer	133.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No
Olivier Reuland	134.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No
Grant Buchan	143.22	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that for higher density zoning in city centres developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No
Grant Buchan	143.23	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that universal accessibility should be a non-negotiable for all developments.	Seeks that universal accessibility is a non-negotiable for all developments in high density zones.	Reject	No
Jill Ford	163.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No
Jill Ford	163.15	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) developments provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Reject	No
Amos Mann	172.23	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that High Density Residential Zone developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No
Patrick Wilkes	173.22	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that High Density Residential Zone developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No
Pete Gent	179.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that High Density Residential Zone developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No
Pete Gent	179.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that High Density Residential Zone developments provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Reject	No
James Harris	180.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it. [Refer to original submission for full details].	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that High Density Residential Zone developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No
James Harris	180.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that High Density Residential Zone developments provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington	182.29	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that a policy similar to that requiring new development to positively contribute to the sense of place, quality and amenity of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone by ensuring that development responds to the site context, particular where it is located adjacent to a scheduled site of significant to Māori, heritage buildings, structures or areas, character precincts, and other areas should be added.	Add a new Policy with equivalent wording to NCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) in the High Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No
Peter Nunns	196.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No
Peter Nunns	196.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should provide universal accessibility.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that High Density Residential Zone developments provide universal accessibility.	Reject	No
Andrew Flanagan	198.15	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Andrew Flanagan	198.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ developments provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Reject	No
Alan Fairless	242.22	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that the District Plan include Sunlight provisions in ALL Residential Zones.	Seeks that the District Plan include Sunlight provisions in High Density Residential Zones.	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Oppose	Inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow	Accept	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Oppose	Inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow	Accept	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.190	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Seeks the addition of a new rule for 'emergency service facilities' for the reasons set out in the previous feedback point on the proposed definitions of 'emergency service facilities'. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that FENZ is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. FENZ considers that adding a new rule for Emergency Service Facilities provides for emergency service facilities in this zone as a permitted activity. This will provide for health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations	Add new HRZ rule: <u>HRZ-RX: Emergency Service Facilities</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u>	Reject	No
Phillippa O'Connor	289.28	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Support	Considers that commercial activities should be able to establish within the residential zones, and that the list of permitted activities is too small and should have a baseline of 100m2 for dairies, restaurants and cafes.	Add a new rule as follows: <u>HRZ-R11 – Dairies, cafes and restaurants</u> <u>1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. The maximum GFA is 100m2</u> <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. Infrastructure and servicing</u> <u>2. Effects on neighbourhood character, residential amenity, safety and the surrounding residential area from building scale, form and appearance; traffic; noise; lighting; and hours of operation</u>	Reject	No
Hilary Watson	321.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that Carrara Park should have 11m height control right round its boundary to get maximum possible sun all year round. Part of the properties around the park are currently inappropriately classified under Building Height Control 2 (21m).	Seeks that all development around Carrara Park is subject to a maximum height limit of 11 metres.	Accept in Part	Yes
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.148	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that Objective 1 of the MDRS must be integrated into the Proposed Plan.	Add new 'well-functioning urban environment' objective in the High Density Residential Zone as follows: <u>HRZ-OX Well-functioning urban environment</u> <u>A well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.</u>	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.149	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Support	Considers that a policy regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites and a policy recognising the changing nature of communities should be integrated into the Proposed Plan.	Add the following new policies in the High Density Residential Zone: <u>HRZ-PX Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within all residential zones by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u> <u>RESZ-PX Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u>	Accept in Part	Yes
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.150	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that a policy regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites and a policy recognising the changing nature of communities should be integrated into the Proposed Plan.	Add the following new policies in the High Density Residential Zone: <u>HRZ-PX Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within all residential zones by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u> <u>RESZ-PX Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u>	Accept in Part	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.151	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Support	Considers that it would be appropriate to enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.	Add new 'Role of density standards' policy in the High Density Residential Zone as follows: <u>HRZ-PX Role of density standards</u> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u>	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.152	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that it would be appropriate to enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.	Add new 'Role of density standards' policy in the High Density Residential Zone as follows: <u>HRZ-PX Role of density standards</u> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u>	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.327	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that the inclusion of a permitted land use rule to provide for mixed use development in multi-unit housing supports the outcomes of the zone and in the NPS-UD.	Add a new Rule to the High Density Residential Zone chapter as follows: <u>HRZ-R2x Commercial activities</u> <u>Activity status: Permitted</u> <u>Where</u> <u>a. They are integrated into a multi-unit residential development;</u> <u>b. in apartment buildings, commercial activities are at street level.</u>	Reject	No
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that the proposed standards for permitted residential activities do not provide for rubbish/recycling storage. It is proposed that a standard be provided to allow for appropriate storage of a minimum standard.	Seeks that a new standard be added in the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter allowing for appropriate rubbish and recycling storage of a minimum standard.	Reject	No
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ (High density) developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) developments provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Reject	No
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel.	Reject	No
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ developments provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Reject	No
David Cadman	398.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No
David Cadman	398.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that HRZ developments provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.99	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that the HRZ objectives do not sufficiently provide for additional infrastructure/ educational facilities. Therefore, the submitter supports the inclusion of a new objective as sought.	Add new objective to HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) as follows: <u>HRZ-OX</u> <u>Non-Residential activities</u> <u>Non-residential activities are in keeping with the amenity of the High Density Residential zone and provide for the community's social, economic, and cultural wellbeing [Inferred decision requested]</u>	Reject	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.89	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Submitter is concerned that there appears to be no provisions that recognise the possible adverse effects of development and especially intensive development adjacent to the heritage area, on the values identified. For the Doctors Common Heritage area the adjoining zoning is high density. The submitter considers that it is hard to see how development to that extent would not compromise the values for which the Heritage Area is recognised.	Add new provisions within the Proposed District Plan to protect the Doctors' Common Heritage Area from possible adverse effects of intensive development adjacent to the heritage area (inferred decision requested).	Accept in Part	Yes
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.76	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that the chapter should include a policy similar to NZC-P7 ensuring that development responds to site context, where it is located adjacent to a site of significance to Māori, heritage place or character precinct.	Add a policy similar to NZC-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) ensuring that development responds to site context, where it is located adjacent to a site of significance to Māori, heritage place or character precinct.	Reject	No
Luke Stewart	422.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that developments in the High Density Residential Zone adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that High Density Residential Zone developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject	No
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that HRZ developments should provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that High Density Residential Zone developments provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Reject	No
Christina Mackay	478.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / New HRZ	Amend	Considers that where heritage listed sites are in HDRZ, the submitter support special height and design controls on those nearby sites to protect context and curtilage setting of heritage listed buildings.	Seeks provisions within High Density Residential Zone to provide for height and design controls for heritage listed sites within zone.	Reject	No
Stratum Management Limited	249.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Amend	Considers that HRZ-O1 references 3-storey buildings and that this appears to be an error that should refer to 6-storey buildings.	Amend HRZ-O1 (Purpose) to refer to 6-storey buildings.	Accept in part	Yes
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.153	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Support in part	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O1 generally aligns with the wording of Objective 2 of the MDRS, however surplus to the requirements of the Act the HRZ-O1 stipulates that the HDR Zone will provide for 'predominantly residential activities'. Considers that this objective conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage development in the zone in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act.	Retain HRZ-O1 (Purpose) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.154	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O1 generally aligns with the wording of Objective 2 of the MDRS, however surplus to the requirements of the Act the HRZ-O1 stipulates that the HDR Zone will provide for 'predominantly residential activities'. Considers that this objective conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage development in the zone in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act.	Amend HRZ-O1 (Purpose) as follows: <u>HRZ-O1 Purpose Residential density</u> The High Density Residential Zone provides for predominantly residential activities and a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to: 1. Housing needs and demand; and 2. The neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including 3-storey buildings.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.155	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Support in part	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O1 generally aligns with the wording of Objective 2 of the MDRS, however surplus to the requirements of the Act the HRZ-O1 stipulates that the HDR Zone will provide for 'predominantly residential activities'. Considers that this objective conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage development in the zone in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act.	Retain HRZ-O1 (Purpose) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.156	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O1 generally aligns with the wording of Objective 2 of the MDRS, however surplus to the requirements of the Act the HRZ-O1 stipulates that the HDR Zone will provide for 'predominantly residential activities'. Considers that this objective conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage development in the zone in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act.	Amend HRZ-O1 (Purpose) to Add new 'Purpose' objective into the High Density Residential Zone as follows: <u>HRZ-OX Purpose</u> <u>The High Density Residential Zone accommodates predominantly residential activities and a range of compatible non-residential activities.</u>	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.157	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Oppose in part	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O1 generally aligns with the wording of Objective 2 of the MDRS, however surplus to the requirements of the Act the HRZ-O1 stipulates that the HDR Zone will provide for 'predominantly residential activities'. Considers that this objective conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage development in the zone in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act.	Opposes HRZ-O1 (Purpose) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.158	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O1 generally aligns with the wording of Objective 2 of the MDRS, however surplus to the requirements of the Act the HRZ-O1 stipulates that the HDR Zone will provide for 'predominantly residential activities'. Considers that this objective conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage development in the zone in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act.	Amend HRZ-O1 (Purpose) to Add new 'Purpose' objective into the High Density Residential Zone as follows: <u>HRZ-OX Purpose</u> <u>The High Density Residential Zone accommodates predominantly residential activities and a range of compatible non-residential activities.</u>	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.328	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Support in part	Support in part.	Retain HRZ-O1 (Purpose) with amendments.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.329	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Amend	Considers that enabling up to twelve stories is appropriate in certain areas where the density is supported by services.	Amend HRZ-O1 (Purpose) as follows: The High Density Residential Zone provides for predominantly residential activities <u>and mixed use activities that support urban living</u> , and a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to: 1. Housing needs and demand; and 2. The neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including 3-storey buildings, <u>and higher density residential living such as apartments of up to twelve storeys.</u>	Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.129	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.366	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O1	Support	Considers that increasing density in Wellington in areas well serviced by transportation and facilities is an important part of reducing the city's carbon footprint; reducing congestion and improving economic and social wellbeing.	Retain HRZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.435	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-01	Support in part	Objective HRZ-01 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Objective HRZ-01 (Purpose) with amendment.	Accept in Part	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.436	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-01	Amend	Considers that HRZ-01 should be amended to better reflect the density necessary to achieve a well-functioning urban environment anticipated by the NPS-UD and RMA. While this objective comes largely from the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (see objective 2), these objectives are mandatory for Medium Density Residential Areas. Therefore, this objective should be adapted to reflect the higher density of the HRZ and to better achieve objective 1 of the RMAA 2021.	Amend Objective HRZ-01 (Purpose) as follows: The High Density Residential Zone provides for predominantly residential activities and a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to: 1. Housing needs and demand; and 2. The neighbourhood's planned urban built character proximate to Centres and Rapid Transit Stops, including 3-6-12 storey buildings.	Accept in part	Yes
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.74	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ01	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure. [Inferred error resolved]	Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater. [Inferred error resolved]	Reject	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.73	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-01	Support	Supports the direction of HRZ-01.	Retain HRZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.	Reject	No
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-02	Support	Supports objective HRZ-02. Notes that Disabled people currently lack housing choices due to the traditional design of housing not enabling accessibility. Concepts, such as Universal Design, need to be incorporated into the design of all new builds and this can be done with a wide range of housing designs.	Retain HRZ-02 (Efficient use of land) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.159	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-02	Support	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-02 is inconsistent with Objectives 1 and 2 of the MDRS. Objectives 1 and 2 of the Act should be included in the Proposed Plan verbatim to their drafting in the MDRS. Questions what the context is in relation to contributing 'positively' to a changing and well-functioning urban environment. Considers that it is unclear what this would entail, particularly when considering that the definition of 'well functioning urban environment' consists of a list of positive / beneficial matters. Considers that it is not clear if this phrasing is stipulating that additional benefit is required in order to contribute 'positively'.	Retain HRZ-02 (Efficient use of land) and seeks amendment as follows: Land within the High Density Residential Zone is used efficiently for residential development that: 1. Increases housing supply and choice; 2. May be of a greater density and scale than the Medium Density Residential Zone; and 3. Contributes positively to a more intensive high-density urban living environment.	Accept.	Yes.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.160	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-02	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-02 is inconsistent with Objectives 1 and 2 of the MDRS. Objectives 1 and 2 of the Act should be included in the Proposed Plan verbatim to their drafting in the MDRS. Questions what the context is in relation to contributing 'positively' to a changing and well-functioning urban environment. Considers that it is unclear what this would entail, particularly when considering that the definition of 'well functioning urban environment' consists of a list of positive / beneficial matters. Considers that it is not clear if this phrasing is stipulating that additional benefit is required in order to contribute 'positively'.	Seeks to amend HRZ-02 (Efficient use of land) as follows: Land within the High Density Residential Zone is used efficiently for residential development that: 1. Increases housing supply and choice; 2. May be of a greater density and scale than the Medium Density Residential Zone; and 3. Contributes positively to a more intensive high-density urban living environment.	Accept.	Yes.
Waka Kotahi	370.33	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-02	Support in part	Supports in part.	Retain HRZ-02 (Efficient use of land) with amendments.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.331	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-02	Amend	Considers that higher densities should be explicitly provided for and expected in the zone, to better align with the direction of the NPS-UD to achieve a compact urban form.	Amend HRZ-02 (Efficient use of land) as follows: Land within the High Density Residential Zone is used efficiently for residential development that: 1. Increases housing supply and choice; 2. May be of a Provides for a greater density and scale than the Medium Density Residential Zone; and 3. Contributes positively to a more intensive high-density urban living environment.	Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-02	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-02 (Efficient use of land) as notified.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.367	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-02	Support	Considers that increasing density in Wellington in areas well serviced by transportation and facilities is an important part of reducing the city's carbon footprint; reducing congestion and improving economic and social wellbeing.	Retain HRZ-02 (Efficient use of land) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.437	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-02	Support in part	Objective HRZ-02 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Objective HRZ-02 (Efficient use of land) with amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.438	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-02	Amend	Considers that HRZ-02 should be amended to better reflect density outcomes anticipated in the HRZ as outlined elsewhere in the submission.	Amend Objective HRZ-02 (Efficient use of land) as follows: Land within the High Density Residential Zone is used efficiently for residential development that: 1. Increases housing supply and choice; 2. May be is of a greater density and scale than the Medium Density Residential Zone;...	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.74	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O2	Support	Supports the direction of HRZ-O2 to provide for more density and scale than the Medium Density Residential Zone and for a more intensive high-density urban living environment. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Retain HRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) as notified.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.191	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O3	Support	Supports the policy as it promotes safe and accessible living environments.	Retain HRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, and accessible living environments) as notified.	Accept	No
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O3	Support	Supports objective HRZ-O3 as enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility.	Retain HRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe and accessible living environments) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.161	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O3	Support	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O3 is inconsistent with Objective 1 and Policy 3 of the MDRS. In addition, notes that HRZ-O3 makes reference to 'accessible living environments'. Opposes regulation of internal environments as retirement village operators are best placed to understand the accessibility requirements of their residents and access is addressed by the Building Act.	Retain HRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) and seeks amendment to delete reference to "accessible living environments".	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.162	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O3	Support	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O3 is inconsistent with Objective 1 and Policy 3 of the MDRS. In addition, notes that HRZ-O3 makes reference to 'accessible living environments'. Opposes regulation of internal environments as retirement village operators are best placed to understand the accessibility requirements of their residents and access is addressed by the Building Act.	Retain HRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) as notified.	Accept	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.163	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O3	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-O3 is inconsistent with Objective 1 and Policy 3 of the MDRS. In addition, notes that HRZ-O3 makes reference to 'accessible living environments'. Opposes regulation of internal environments as retirement village operators are best placed to understand the accessibility requirements of their residents and access is addressed by the Building Act.	Seeks to amend HRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) to delete reference to "accessible living environments".	Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.131	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe and accessible living environments) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.368	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-O3	Support	Considers that increased density needs to be done well: this objective gives an important signal to ensure that this is achieved.	Retain HRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe and accessible living environments) as notified.	Accept	No
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.	Accept	No
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Oppose in part	Considers that should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the enabled activities policies and permitted land use activity rules applying to supported residential care activities in the Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Large Lot Residential and Corrections zones are retained as notified. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities. Such activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.	Retain HRZ-P1.4 (Enabled activities) as notified if "supported residential care activity" definition and references to this term are retained.	Accept	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.192	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Support in part	Seeks to amend HRZ-P1 to enable the establishment of emergency service facilities in the High Density Residential zone. Considers emergency service activities, including the establishment of fire stations, are an integral part of providing for the health, safety, and wellbeing of people in the community.	Supports HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities), with amendment.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.193	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Amend	Seeks to amend HRZ-P1 to enable the establishment of emergency service facilities in the High Density Residential zone. Considers emergency service activities, including the establishment of fire stations, are an integral part of providing for the health, safety, and wellbeing of people in the community.	Amend HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable residential activities and other activities that are compatible with the purpose of the High Density Residential Zone, while ensuring their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone, including: 1. Home business; 2. Boarding houses; 3. Visitor accommodation; 4. Supported residential care; 5. Childcare services; and 6. Community gardens; and 7. Emergency service facilities.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Phillippa O'Connor	289.29	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Amend	Considers the scope of activities enabled in the Medium Density Residential zone are limited and do not align with current rule HRZ-R10 or proposed new rule HRZ-P11.	Amend Policy HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable residential activities and other activities that are compatible with the purpose of the High Density Residential Zone, while ensuring their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone, including: 1- Home Business; 2- Boarding Houses; 3- Visitor Accommodation; 4- Supported Residential Care; 5- Childcare Services; and 6- Community Gardens.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.164	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Oppose	Considers that the policy appears to identify / support the permitted activities of the MDR Zone- being some residential activities (e.g. boarding houses, visitor accommodation and supported residential care), and some non-residential activities (e.g. home businesses, childcare services and community gardens). Considers that retirement villages are residential activities that should be permitted in the residential zones. Rather than listing retirement villages in this policy, considers that an enabling retirement village-specific policy (MRZ-P6) is more appropriate. Considers that while the policy is seeking to 'enable' the permitted activities in the zone, the phrasing of the policy qualifies this enabling provision by reference to a scale and intensity that is 'consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the zone'. Considers this part of MRZ-P1 conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act for the MRZ. Considers that MRZ-P1 appears to summarise provisions provided elsewhere in the chapter, but in a confusing manner that does not provide any additional guidance for consent applicants or other users of the District Plan.	Delete HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) in its entirety as notified.	Reject	Yes
Waka Kotahi	370.332	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Support in part	Supports in part.	Retain HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) with amendments.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.333	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Amend	Considers that to support the higher densities, commercial activities (particularly at ground floor) should be enabled and encouraged where they are integrated with residential development	Amend HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable residential activities and other activities that are compatible with the purpose of the High Density Residential Zone, while ensuring their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone, including: 1. Home business; 2. Boarding houses; 3. Visitor accommodation; 4. Supported residential care; 5. Childcare services; and 6. Community gardens. 7. <u>Commercial activities where they are integrated with residential development.</u>	Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.132	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.369	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Support	Considers that increasing density in Wellington in areas well serviced by transportation and facilities is an important part of reducing the city's carbon footprint; reducing congestion and improving economic and social wellbeing.	Retain HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.439	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Support in part	Policy HRZ-P1 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Policy HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.440	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Amend	Considers that the wording should be updated to better recognise the intent of the NPS-UD (particularly Policy 6) that recognises the planned urban built form and that change to existing amenity is not in itself an adverse effect.	Amend Policy HRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable residential activities and other activities that are compatible with the purpose of the High Density Residential Zone, while ensuring their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values anticipated and planned built form of for the Zone, including:	Reject	No
LIVE WELLington	FS96.34	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Oppose	The proposal to delete the term 'amenity' from this point is opposed, along with all other attempts to remove 'amenity' from the Plan.	Disallow	Accept	No
Roland Sapsford	FS117.33	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P1	Oppose	The proposal to delete the term 'amenity' from this point is opposed, along with all other attempts to remove 'amenity' from the Plan.	Disallow	Accept	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Antony Wilkinson	11.1	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Oppose in part	Opposes HRZ-P2 on the grounds that increasing the height limit to 6 stories will negatively affect the character of the city and its suburbs. Population growth estimates from the Council are too optimistic and should not warrant six-story residential buildings being built.	Seeks that the height limit of up to 6 stories in HRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) be rescinded.	Reject	No
Khol Phan	326.30	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend HRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as follows: Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the zone, including 3-storey attached and detached dwellings, low-rise apartments, and residential buildings of up to 6-15 15 storeys in height.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.165	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Support in part	Considers that the current drafting of HRZ-P2 generally aligns with the wording of Policy 1 of the Act, with amendments that respond to Policy 3 of the NPSUD. The drafting could be improved to clarify the references to 3-storeys and 6- storeys, which conflict on their face.	Retain HRZ-P2 as notified, subject to drafting improvements.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.334	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Support in part	Support in part.	Retain HRZ-P2 (Enable a variety of housing) with amendments.	Accept in Part	No
Waka Kotahi	370.335	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Amend	Considers that higher densities should be explicitly provided for and expected in the zone, to better align with the direction of the NPS-UD to achieve a compact urban form. This should include provision for apartments of appropriate heights and dwellings of four storeys.	Amend HRZ-P2 (Enable a variety of housing) as follows: Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the zone, including 3-4 4-storey townhouses attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments of up to twelve storeys in height in suitable locations, and residential buildings of up to 6 storeys in height. 12 storeys in height.	Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.133	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as notified.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.37	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Support	Considers that provision for a wide variety of housing types is essential if we are to achieve the city's social, economic and environmental goals.	Retain HRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.441	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Support in part	Policy HRZ-P2 is supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Policy HRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.442	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Amend	Considers amendments are needed to provide for a higher density.	Amend Policy HRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as follows: Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the zone, including 3-6 6-storey attached and detached dwellings, low-rise apartments, and residential buildings of up to 6-12 12-storeys in height located close to higher order centres.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	F584.75	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure. [Inferred error resolved]	Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater. [Inferred error resolved]	Accept	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.75	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P2	Support	Supports HRZ-P2, noting the storey limits mentioned in this policy do not preclude developments which do not meet permitted activity standard.	Retain HRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as notified, on the basis HRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) is also retained.	Accept	No
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Amend	Considers that replacing the term 'abilities' with 'impairments' in HRZ-P3 is more appropriate. Notes that using the term 'abilities' to refer to disabled people is regarded as euphemistic by many within the disabled community.	Amend HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as follows: Enable housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents, and encourage a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures to cater for people of all ages, lifestyles and abilities impairments. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in Part	Yes
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.166	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Oppose	Considers that the current drafting of the first part of HRZ-P3 aligns with the wording of Policy 4 of the MDRS; however surplus to the requirements of the Act HRZ-P3 seeks to 'encourage a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures to cater for people of all ages, lifestyles and abilities', which is generally already covered by HRZ-P2.	Opposes HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) and seeks amendment	Accept in part	Yes
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.167	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of the first part of HRZ-P3 aligns with the wording of Policy 4 of the MDRS; however surplus to the requirements of the Act HRZ-P3 seeks to 'encourage a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures to cater for people of all ages, lifestyles and abilities', which is generally already covered by HRZ-P2.	Amend HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as follows: Enable housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents, and encourage a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures to cater for people of all ages, lifestyles and abilities.	Accept in part	Yes
Waka Kotahi	370.336	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Support in part	Support in part.	Retain HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) with amendment.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Waka Kotahi	370.337	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Amend	Considers that to support the higher densities, commercial activities (particularly at ground floor) should be enabled and encouraged where they are integrated with residential development	Amend HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as follows: Enable housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents, and encourage a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, <u>and commercial activities where appropriately integrated into residential development</u> , to cater for people of all ages, lifestyles and abilities.	Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.134	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as notified.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.371	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Support	Considers that the policy sends an important signal about the quality of housing in high density areas: it is essential that density is done well, and that those living in such areas can do so in a way that meets their health and wellbeing.	Retain HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.443	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Support in part	Policy HRZ-P3 is supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Policy HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.444	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Amend	Considers that an amendment to HRZ-P3 is required to remove reference to tenure to recognise that tenures cannot and should not be managed through the District Plan.	Amend Policy HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as follows: Enable housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents, and encourage a variety of housing types, <u>and sizes and tenures</u> to cater for people of all ages, lifestyles and abilities.	Reject	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.76	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P3	Support	Supports the direction of HRZ-P3 to provide for a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures.	Retain HRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as notified.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.168	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P4	Support	Supports HRZ-P4 to the extent it aligns with Policy 2 of the MDRS. However, considers that the replacement of "all relevant residential zones" with reference to the HRZ creates interpretation issues as it suggests the medium density residential standards do not apply in parts of the HRZ (but not what standards apply instead). Areas subject to qualifying matters have not been zoned HRZ so that part of the policy is not required.	Retain HRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) and seeks amendment as follows: Apply the medium density residential standards across the High Density Residential Zone except in circumstances where a qualifying matter is relevant (including matters of significance such as historic heritage and the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga).	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.169	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P4	Amend	Supports HRZ-P4 to the extent it aligns with Policy 2 of the MDRS. However, considers that the replacement of "all relevant residential zones" with reference to the HRZ creates interpretation issues as it suggests the medium density residential standards do not apply in parts of the HRZ (but not what standards apply instead). Areas subject to qualifying matters have not been zoned HRZ so that part of the policy is not required.	Retain HRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) and seeks amendment as follows: Apply the medium density residential standards across the High Density Residential Zone except in circumstances where a qualifying matter is relevant (including matters of significance such as historic heritage and the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga).	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.338	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P4	Support in part	Support in part.	Retain HRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) with amendments.	Accept in part	Yes
Waka Kotahi	370.339	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P4	Amend	The submitter considers that given that higher densities and a more urban form are anticipated in the High Density Residential Zone, Waka Kotahi considers that the permitted level of development should be higher – to support the urban change outcomes in the NPS-UD.	Amend HRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) as follows: Apply the medium density residential standards across the High Density Residential Zone except in circumstances where a qualifying matter is relevant (including matters of significance such as historic heritage and the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga), <u>and enable higher permitted threshold of development due to the more urban character of the High Density Residential Zone.</u>	Accept in part	Yes
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.135	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) as notified.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.372	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P4	Support	Considers the provision is reasonable in light of legitimate qualifying matters	Retain HRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.445	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P4	Support	Policy HRZ-P4 is supported.	Retain Policy HRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) as notified.	Reject	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.77	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P4	Amend	Support the application of the Medium Density Residential Zone standards to the High Density Residential Zone, however, these standards should apply as a minimum. The submitter considers that the High Density Residential Zone should be more permissive than the Medium Density Residential Zone. If this does not occur, then the submitter considers that the High Density Residential Zone will become a de facto Medium Density Residential Zone.	Amend HRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) to ensure the residential standards in the High Density Residential Zone are more permissive, and encourage denser and more intensive development than that permitted within the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept in part	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P5	Support	Supports HRZ-P5 as it aligns with Policy 5 of the MDRS.	Retain HRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) as notified.	Accept	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.136	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.446	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P5	Support	Policy HRZ-P5 is supported.	Retain Policy HRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) as notified.	Accept	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.78	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P5	Support	Supports HRZ-P5 for developments that do not meet the permitted activity status. The submitter considers that this retains flexibility for quality development proposals.	Retain HRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) as notified.	Accept	No
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.39	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P5	Amend	Considers that since this rule makes all multi-unit housing a RD activity and refers back to broad policies as matters of discretion, Council's scope is too broad for an RD activity. Considers this may risk failing to meet S77B, and Council is already required to consider relevant policies under 104(1)(b).	Amend HRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) to: Provide for developments not meeting permitted activity status, while encouraging high-quality developments buildings.	Reject	No
Stratum Management Limited	249.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that policy HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) relates to the provision of multi-unit housing. It seeks to provide for multi-unit housing where the development can demonstrate four factors. The first matter relates to 'fulfilling' the intent of the residential design guide. The residential design guide, as notified, contains 137 individual guidelines. Considers that it is unclear how, or at what point, any given multi-unit development can fulfil the intent of the design guide given that a design guide assessment is inherently a subjective assessment. Seeks clarification as to whether the intent of the design guide is fulfilled when a proposal is considered to achieve more than 50% of the applicable design guides for example? Considers that the approach to this matter is also inconsistent with the approach adopted by the City Centre zone. In that zone, the reference to the design guide is made within the matters for discretion of, for example, Rule CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures). It also omits reference to 'fulfilling the intent of' the design guide. This approach is preferred. The second matter requires the provision of a minimum area of private or shared open space. In the context of this policy, a multi-unit development that does not meet the minimum area standard should not be provided for. Notwithstanding that non-compliance with the standard can be considered through a resource consent process. Matter 3 requires the provision for on site management of waste storage and collection. This matter is also considered through the design guide. Stratum invites further consideration of the appropriate means to achieve this and suggests that there may be duplication across the policy and design guide.	Amend HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows: Delete matter (1); Delete the words 'a minimum area of' from matter (2); Consider whether the policy needs to address matters relating to waste storage and collection.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.194	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for multi-unit housing and retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development can be adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure, or can address any constraints on the site	Retain HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as notified.	Reject t	No
Phillippa O'Connor	289.30	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that Reference to the Design Guide as a matter of discretion (by virtue of referring to Policy HRZ-P6 in the matters of discretion for activities requiring consent under HRZ-R2.2) is challenged and deletion sought accordingly. Given the prescriptive, yet subjective, nature of the assessment, elevating this Guide to a statutory requirement for compliance or assessment is not considered appropriate or commensurate in respect of a restricted discretionary activity assessment.	Amend HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows: Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development: 1. Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide; 1. 2. Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants; 2. 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and 3. 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.	Reject	No
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.44	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) with amendment.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.45	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that HRZ-P6 should be amended, as multi-unit housing and other non-residential activities and building cannot require car parking as set out in the NPS-UD. Developments should provide adequate and appropriately located cycle and micromobility parking to align with infrastructure and transport objectives in the PDP.	Amend HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows: Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development: 1. Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide; 2. Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants; 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site. 5. <u>Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for cycle and micromobility parking and charging;</u> 6. <u>Adequate cycle facilities are accessible, secure, and covered (protected from weather)</u>	Reject	No
Z Energy Limited	361.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that as it stands, the PDP will enable the construction and use of three dwellings on properties that share a common boundary with the Z on Constable Street, with a maximum height of 11m and more permissive building recession planes, as a permitted activity. In addition, resource consents may be obtained as a restricted discretionary activity to construct buildings on these properties up to 25m in height with no limit to the number of residential units (i.e.: density). These greater residential densities and more permissive building standards are likely to generate greater potential for reverse sensitivity effects that may affect the ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade of Z facilities which are a physical resource that must be managed under the Act. Several of Z Energy's service stations either directly adjoin or are located in close proximity. The proposed changes to the residential zone provisions and consequential increase in development potential on these surrounding sites have the potential to generate reverse sensitivity effects including nuisance effects (e.g. noise, lighting and odour displacement) and amenity effects. For instance, an occupier on a third storey apartment building is more likely to perceive noise and visual effects compared to an occupier of single storey dwelling which is less elevated and, more than likely, screened by a fence and landscaping. [Refer to original submission, including table of Z sites]	Amend HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows: Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development: 1. Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide; 2. Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants; 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site. 5. <u>Manages reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities.</u>	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	F589.156	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP6	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought relating to recognition of reverse sensitivity in matters of discretion due to potential impacts on residential intensification.	Disallow	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.340	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Support in part	Supports in part.	Retain HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) with amendments.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.341	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that multi-unit housing should be appropriately designed and insulated to mitigate noise effects from the existing environment in the interests of the human health of occupants. considers that commercial activities should be encouraged and supported where appropriate and integrated with residential development.	Amend HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows: ... 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.; and 5. <u>Where located in proximity to legally established activities that emit noise (such as State Highways), buildings for noise sensitive activities are designed to mitigate noise and vibration effects to occupants.</u> 6. <u>For higher density developments, options to incorporate mixed-uses such as commercial activities have been explored.</u>	Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.137	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Support in part	HRZ-P6 is partially supported, but amendments are required for proposed residential developments that adjoin or are in close proximity to lawfully established non-residential activities where reverse sensitivity effects might occur.	Retain HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) with amendment.	Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.138	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that HRZ-P6 should be amended to better protect larger-scale and higher-density residential developments where they have been appropriately designed to manage reverse sensitivity where there is an interface with a Commercial or Mixed-Use Zone, or with lawfully established non-residential activities. Amendments are required for proposed residential developments that adjoin or are in close proximity to lawfully established non-residential activities where reverse sensitivity effects might occur. The following relief appropriately gives effect to design principle 1(c): 'The Site' of the National Medium Density Design Guide (Ministry for the Environment, May 2022) which encourages new development to respond to existing or proposed nearby non-residential activities.	Amend HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows: Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development: 1. Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide; 2. Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants; 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site. 5. <u>Manages reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities.</u>	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.49	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ – P6	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought due to potential impacts on the scale of residential intensification.	Disallow	Accept	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.16	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in these submission points as reverse sensitivity should be managed through appropriate setback provisions rather than requiring activities contemplated in the zone to manage the effects of activities outside the zone.	Disallow	Accept	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.16	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in these submission points as reverse sensitivity should be managed through appropriate setback provisions rather than requiring activities contemplated in the zone to manage the effects of activities outside the zone.	Disallow	Accept	No
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) with amendment.	Reject	No
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that the collection of waste from multi-unit housing sites needs the waste storage areas to be accessed by rubbish trucks or conveniently walked to the kerb for pickup. Specific consideration of the accessibility of waste collection by collection trucks needs to be ensured.	Seeks that specific consideration of the accessibility of waste collection by collection truck be ensured in HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing).	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.373	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Seeks that there is a need to ensure multi-unit developments reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle when considered for consenting.	Amend HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) to add a new Point 5 to the list, as follows: ... <u>5. Reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle.</u>	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.447	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Support in part	Policy HRZ-P6 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Policy HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.448	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Seeks amendments to Policy HRZ-P6. Considers that residential development should be considered on the basis of its effects and merits rather than specifically on typology or the scale/collective number of dwellings. Therefore is requesting deletion of 'multiunit housing' as a separate activity type from stand-alone houses or any other residential typology for the purposes of the zone rules and standards. Also considers that the policy should allow reference to more than three residential units on a site as they are managed through resource consent process.	Amend Policy HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows: Multi-unit housing Higher density residential development Provide for multi-unit housing more than six residential units per site where it can be demonstrated that the development: 1. Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide Achieves the following urban design outcomes: <u>1. Provides an effective public private interface;</u> <u>2. The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u> <u>3. Provides high quality buildings;</u> <u>4. Responds to the natural environment;</u> 2. Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants; 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and 4. Is adequately able to be serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any <u>water</u> constraints on the site.	Accept in part	Yes
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.33	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Disallow / Seeks to retain greater guarantees of proportionate and quality development than the unquantified terms proposed.	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.147	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ P6	Oppose	Considers the submission is more enabling than MDRS requirements without adequate justification.	Disallow	Reject	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.79	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Submitter considers that the matters in clauses 1, 2 and 4 can be addressed elsewhere and do not meet the section 32, Resource Management Act 1991 tests for appropriateness. In particular: • The Residential Design Guide should be non-statutory [Refer to original submission for full reason]. • External areas should not be mandated [Refer to original submission for full reason]. As drafted, these additional requirements for multi-unit housing (which do not apply to housing which complies with the Medium Density Residential Zone standards) may defeat the purpose of the High Density Residential Zone which is to provide for more intensive development than that permitted within the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Amend HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows: Multi-unit housing Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development: 1- Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide; 2- Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants; 3- Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and 4- Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.254	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.254	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.	Reject	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.80	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that the matters in clauses 1, 2 and 4 can be addressed elsewhere and do not meet the section 32, Resource Management Act 1991 tests for appropriateness. In particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Residential Design Guide should be non-statutory [Refer to original submission for full reason]. External areas should not be mandated [Refer to original submission for full reason]. <p>As drafted, these additional requirements for multi-unit housing (which do not apply to housing which complies with the Medium Density Residential Zone standards) may defeat the purpose of the High Density Residential Zone which is to provide for more intensive development than that permitted within the Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>	Amend HRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) so that any particular design outcomes required be included expressly as a policy, rather than through the Residential Design Guide.	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.255	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.	Reject	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.255	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P6	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.195	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for multi-unit housing and retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development can be adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure, or can address any constraints on the site	Retain HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) as notified.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.171	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Support in part	Considers generally that HRZ-P7 does not appropriately provide for / recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, that they may require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services, and have unique layouts and internal amenity needs to cater to the needs of residents.	Retain HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.172	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Amend	Considers generally that HRZ-P7 does not appropriately provide for / recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, that they may require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services, and have unique layouts and internal amenity needs to cater to the needs of residents.	Amend HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) as follows: Provide for retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development: 1. Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide where it is relevant; 2. Includes outdoor space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of the residents of the village; 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site; and 5. Is of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the zone. 1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages. 2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they... 3. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services. 4. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.342	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Support in part	Supports in part.	Retain HRZ-P7 (Retirement village) with amendments.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.343	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Amend	Considers that retirement villages in urban areas should be suitably located to ensure that they are not car-centric developments. Consideration of location, access to services for residents with varying degrees of mobility should be included in any development proposal.	Amend HRZ-P7 (Retirement village) as follows: ... 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site; and 5. Is of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the zone.; and 6. Is suitably located and designed to enable multimodal connectivity.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.344	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Support in part	Waka Kotahi supports the permitted activity status for childcare service activities for up to 10 children, the effects of larger scale activities of this nature should be assessed through a resource consent and the RD activity status for childcare activities exceeding 10 children at a time is considered appropriate.	Retain HRZ-P7 (Child care services) with amendments.	Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Companies (the Fuel Companies)	372.139	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) as notified.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) with amendment.	Reject	No
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.21	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Amend	Considers that the collection of waste from retirement villages needs the waste storage areas to be accessed by rubbish trucks or conveniently walked to the kerb for pickup. Specific consideration of the accessibility of waste collection by collection trucks needs to be ensured.	Seeks that specific consideration of the accessibility of waste collection by collection trucks be ensured in HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages).	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.24	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Not specified	The RVA supports the intent of the relief sought in this submission but further clarification about the amendment sought is required.	Amend / Further clarification about the specific relief sought is required.	Reject	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.24	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Not specified	Ryman supports the intent of the relief sought in this submission but further clarification about the amendment sought is required.	Amend / Further clarification about the specific relief sought is required.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.374	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Amend	Considers that there is a need to ensure retirement villages reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle when considered for consenting.	Amend HRZ-P7 (Retirement Villages) to add a new Point 6 to the list, as follows: ... <u>6. Reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle.</u>	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.449	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Support in part	Policy HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Supports Policy HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.138	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Not specified	The RVA supports the intent of the policy and agrees with the removal of the design guides, however The RVA opposes the submission point seeking to include new urban design outcomes. It is not clear what 'responds to the natural environment' is intended to entail, and the new outcomes are inconsistent with the relief sought in The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Disallow the submission point in favour of the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.	Accept in part	Yes
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.138	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Not specified	Ryman supports the intent of the policy and agrees with the removal of the design guides, however Ryman opposes the submission point seeking to include new urban design outcomes. It is not clear what 'responds to the natural environment' is intended to entail, and the new outcomes are inconsistent with the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Disallow the submission point in favour of the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.450	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Amend	Considers amendments to HRZ-P7 is required to remove direct reference to the design guide and instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought and to recognise changing amenity in accordance with the NPSUD.	Amend Policy HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) as follows: Provide for retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development: 1. Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide where it is relevant <u>Achieves the following urban design outcomes:</u> <u>a. Provides an effective public private interface;</u> <u>b. The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u> <u>c. Provides high quality buildings;</u> <u>d. Responds to the natural environment;</u> 2. Includes outdoor space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of the residents of the village; 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; 4. Is <u>adequately able to be</u> serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site; and 5. Is of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values <u>amenity values</u> anticipated <u>and planned built form</u> for the Zone.	Accept in part	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.139	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Not specified	The RVA supports the intent of the policy and agrees with the removal of the design guides, however The RVA opposes the submission point seeking to include new urban design outcomes. It is not clear what 'responds to the natural environment' is intended to entail, and the new outcomes are inconsistent with the relief sought in The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Disallow the submission point in favour of the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.	Accept in part	Yes
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.139	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P7	Not specified	Ryman supports the intent of the policy and agrees with the removal of the design guides, however Ryman opposes the submission point seeking to include new urban design outcomes. It is not clear what 'responds to the natural environment' is intended to entail, and the new outcomes are inconsistent with the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Disallow the submission point in favour of the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.	Accept in part	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.196	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P8	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for a range of residential buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, that provide for healthy, safe and accessible living environments.	Retain HRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) as notified.	Reject	No
Philip O'Reilly and Julie Saddington	310.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P8	Amend	HRZ-P8 is weak in giving guidance on managing the interface between the Character Precincts and other zones and should be amended to have an additional sub-point. Adding this additional sub-point will result in the same outcome of improved management between the High Density Residential and Character Precincts.	Amend HRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) as follows: ... <u>4. Achieve attractive and safe streets; and</u> <u>5. Where these buildings and structures are in a site adjacent to a character and heritage precinct, their form and scale be sympathetic towards the identified Character Precinct and heritage precinct values.</u>	Accept in part	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.173	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P8	Oppose in part	Considers it is not clear whether MRZ-P8 [HRZ-P8] applies to retirement villages, given MRZ-P7 [HRZ-P7] is a more specific policy. The RVA seeks that this policy does not apply to retirement villages.	Opposes HRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.174	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P8	Amend	Considers it is not clear whether MRZ-P8 [HRZ-P8] applies to retirement villages, given MRZ-P7 [HRZ-P7] is a more specific policy. The RVA seeks that this policy does not apply to retirement villages.	Amend HRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) to clarify that it does not apply to retirement villages.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.345	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P8	Support in part	Supports in part.	Retain HRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) with amendments.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.346	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P8	Amend	Considers that multi-unit housing should be appropriately designed and insulated to mitigate noise effects from the existing environment in the interests of the human health of occupants. Considers that commercial activities should be encouraged and supported where appropriate and integrated with residential development.	Amend HRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) as follows: ... 4. Achieve attractive and safe streets, and 5. Where located in proximity to legally established activities that emit noise (such as State Highways), are designed to mitigate noise and vibration effects on sensitive receivers; 6. For higher density developments, options to incorporate mixed-uses such as commercial activities at ground floor have been explored.	Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.140	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P8	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) as notified.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.375	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P8	Support	HRZ-P8 is supported as it is important in ensuring that density is done well.	Retain HRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.451	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P8	Support	Policy HRZ-P8 is generally supported.	Retain HRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) as notified.	Reject	No
Trelissick Park Group	168.24	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P9	Amend	Considers that HRZ-P9 is too vague and should be amended to require at least neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development.	Amend HRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) to require neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development.	Addressed in Report 5C	
Tyers Stream Group	221.74	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P9	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks amendment to HRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) so that the level of permeable surface is proportionate to the extent of hard surface increase from the development.	Addressed in Report 5C	
Wellington City Council	266.143	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P9	Oppose in part	Considers that given this is not a building provision, but a three waters/infrastructure provision, it is more logical to locate this policy in the THW chapter. Note: HRZ-P9 and HRZ-S10 are to be relocated to THW – see new THW-P6 and THW-R7.	Delete HRZ-P9 (Permeable Surface) in its entirety. Consequential renumbering of HRZ-P10 to HRZ-P14 to reflect change in numbering.	Accept	Yes
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.141	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P9	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) as notified.	Addressed in Report 5C	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.376	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P9	Support	HRZ-P9 is supported as it is important in ensuring that increased density manages risks of stormwater runoff including risks to water quality and flooding.	Retain HRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) as notified.	Addressed in Report 5C	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.452	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P9	Support in part	Policy HRZ-P9 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Supports Policy HRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) and seeks amendment.	Addressed in Report 5C	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.453	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P9	Amend	Considers that an amendment is required to HRZ-P9 to relate to sufficient permeable surface provision rather than a minimum. There may be instances where stormwater runoff effects can be mitigated by a lower level of permeable surface area and the policy should recognise this.	Amend Policy HRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) as follows: Require development to provide a minimum level of sufficient permeable surface area to assist with reducing the rate and amount of storm water run-off.	Addressed in Report 5C	No
Tyers Stream Group	221.75	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P10	Amend	Considers that new 'landscaping' should be required, not just 'sought'.	Amend HRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as follows: Encourage the retention of existing vegetation, particularly native vegetation and visually prominent trees that may not otherwise be protected, and where vegetation is proposed to be removed, seek require new landscaping of equal or better quality to help integrate new development into the surrounding environment and minimise hard surfacing.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.175	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P10	Oppose in part	Considers that the requirement to provide "equal or better quality" vegetation where existing vegetation is removed is unlikely to be feasible alongside residential intensification.	Opposes HRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.176	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P10	Amend	Considers that the requirement to provide "equal or better quality" vegetation where existing vegetation is removed is unlikely to be feasible alongside residential intensification.	Amend HRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) to encourage new landscaping but delete reference to "equal or better quality."	Reject	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.142	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P10	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.377	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P10	Support	HRZ-P10 is supported as it is important to assist with reducing unnecessary loss of vegetation, with benefits to biodiversity, pleasantness and amenity, as well as helping reduce the rate and amount of storm water run-off.	Retain HRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as notified.	Accept	No
Director-General of Conservation	385.82	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P10	Support	Supports the use of policy which encourages the retention of existing vegetation (including native vegetation) that would otherwise be unprotected under the Proposed District Plan.	Retain HRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.454	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P10	Support	Policy HRZ-P10 is generally supported.	Retain Policy HRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as notified.	Accept	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.81	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P10	Amend	Considers that the retention of existing vegetation (other than protected vegetation) is difficult to reconcile with the more intensive urban built form encouraged in the High Density Residential Zone.	Option 1: Delete HRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) in its entirety.	Reject	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.82	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P10	Amend	Considers that the retention of existing vegetation (other than protected vegetation) is difficult to reconcile with the more intensive urban built form encouraged in the High Density Residential Zone.	Option 2: Amend HRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) to acknowledge the greater intensity encouraged in the High Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.177	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P11	Support	Supports HRZ-P11 as it aligns with Policy 3 of the MDRS.	Retain HRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.347	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P11	Support	Support policy wording as it requires consideration of passive surveillance.	Retain HRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.	Accept	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.143	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P11	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.378	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P11	Support	HRZ-P11 is supported as it will help ensure attractiveness at street level, as well as provide for passive surveillance: designing for safety is highly important in built environments.	Retain HRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.455	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P11	Support	Policy HRZ-P11 is generally supported.	Retain Policy HRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.	Accept	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.144	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P12	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P12 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified.	Accept	No
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.22	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P12	Support	HRZ-P12 is supported as it will encourage the diversion of waste appropriately. The definition for community gardens does not allow for composting of food waste specifically, which may preclude the undertaking of food waste composting. [Submitter identified HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) instead of HRZ-P12 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation); submission points have been changed to refer to HRZ-P12]	Retain HRZ-P12 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.379	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P12	Support	Considers that the policy will help compensate for residents having less available green space, and provide for community building and public health, as well as potential infrastructure for green waste recycling at a local scale: important for the circular economy.	Retain HRZ-P12 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.456	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P12	Support	Policy HRZ-P12 is generally supported.	Retain Policy HRZ-P12 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified.	Accept	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
ViLabour	414.32	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P12	Support	Supports provision for community gardens and urban agriculture and considers a green city and more community spaces is needed.	Retain HRZ-P12 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.77	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P12	Support	Supports policy HRZ-P12 in the High-Density Residential Zone Chapter, as provisions for community gardens and circular production supports more sustainable living which is beneficial in response to climate change.	Retain HRZ-P12 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified.	Accept	No
Property Council New Zealand	338.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Amend	Considers that incentives for large developments that can demonstrate a City Outcomes Contribution (such as priority consenting) would establish a quid pro quo system and enable growth rather than placing additional obstacles for large-scale development to occur.	Seeks that incentives be provided to encourage but not require large developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions.	Addressed in Report 4A	
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.204	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 4A	
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.204	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 4A	
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Support	Supports policy HRZ-P13 and widest possible application of the City Outcomes Contribution through the Environmental and Accessibility Performance Fund established by the WCC in order to incentivise the building of housing and public buildings to Universal Design standards. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]	Retain HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Addressed in Report 4A	
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.1	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Support	Supports policy HRZ-P13 and widest possible application of the City Outcomes Contribution through the Environmental and Accessibility Performance Fund established by the WCC in order to incentivise the building of housing and public buildings to Universal Design standards. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]	Retain HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Addressed in Report 4A	
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.178	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of the City Outcomes Contribution requirements of HRZ-P13 and considers that any requirements associated with developments that are under or over height should directly relate to mitigation of potential or actual effects. Considers that the policy would create barriers that strongly conflict with the need to resolve the housing crisis and address the needs of the rapidly growing aging population.	Delete HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) in its entirety as notified.	Addressed in Report 4A	
Waka Kotahi	370.348	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Support in part	Supports in part.	Retain HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) with amendments.	Addressed in Report 4A	
Waka Kotahi	370.349	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Amend	Considers that commercial activities should be encouraged and supported where appropriate and integrated with residential development.	Amend HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) as follows: 5. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility.; and/or 6. Incorporating non-residential uses to provide for mixed use development.	Addressed in Report 4A	
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.145	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) as notified.	Addressed in Report 4A	
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.457	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	Policy HRZ-P13 is opposed and amendment is sought.	Opposes Policy HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) and amendment is sought.	Addressed in Report 4A	
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.140	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to remove the design guides in full.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 4A	
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.140	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to remove the design guides in full.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 4A	

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.458	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to Policy HRZ-P13 to instead encourage positive outcomes for development in the HRZ. [See original submission for further details]	Amend Policy HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contributions) as follows: Require over height, large-scale residential Encourage development in the High Density Residential Zone to contribute to positive outcomes deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Residential Design Guide, including through either: 1. Positively contributing to public space provision and the amenity of the site and surrounding area; and/or 2. Incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience; and/or 3. Incorporating construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs; and/or 4. Incorporating assisted housing into the development, and where this is provided legal instruments are required to ensure that it remains assisted housing for at least 25 years; and/or 5. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility.	Addressed in Report 4A	
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.141	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to remove the design guides in full.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 4A	
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.141	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to remove the design guides in full.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 4A	
Investore Property Limited	405.55	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	Considers that the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions are inappropriate. Specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development which he submitter considers is inappropriate. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]	Seeks that HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) is deleted in its entirety as notified.	Addressed in Report 4A	
VicLabour	414.33	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Support in part	Supportive of the inclusion of a points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits (the city outcomes contribution mechanism) but considers it an example of how arbitrary and excessive many of these regulations are, particularly around height and character protections.	Seeks to retain points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits. [Inferred decision requested]	Addressed in Report 4A	
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.83	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Amend	The submitter considers that while they are generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc). As currently drafted, the initiative remains "subject to" numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions. HRZ-P13 is also phrased to "require" City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes. The City Outcomes Contribution should be reviewed to reflect any amendments made to CCZ-P11 and the relevant provisions in the Design Guides.	Seeks that HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) be reconsidered following any amendments to the City Outcomes Contribution within the City Centre Zone.	Addressed in Report 4A	
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.256	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.	Addressed in Report 4A	
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.256	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.	Addressed in Report 4A	
Fabric Property Limited	425.49	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P13	Oppose	Opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list. The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of "density done well" as stated in the Design Guide. Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.	Delete HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) in it's entirety.	Addressed in Report 4A	

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited	FS45.9	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Support	McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited supports these submissions seeking deletion of the City Outcomes Contributions. While MRNZL recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Allow	Addressed in Report 4A	
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.197	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Support	Supports the policy as it enables non-residential activities and buildings that support the needs of the local communities which provides for emergency service facilities to locate in this zone. This policy also supports non-residential activities that maintain the safety of the transport network and are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure	Retain HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities, and boarding houses) as notified.	Reject	No
Phillippa O'Connor	289.31	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Amend	Considers that Non-residential activities (being activities already contemplated by the zone by way of restricted discretionary or discretionary activities, or ones that infringe the zone standards) should be able to be accommodated in the zone if they can demonstrate the requirements of the policy.	Amend HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows: Only Allow non-residential activities and buildings that: 1. Support the needs of local communities; 2. Are of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone; 3. Contribute positively to the urban environment and achieve attractive and safe streets; 4. Reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle; 5. Maintain the safety and efficiency of the transport network; and 6. Are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.	Accept in Part	Yes
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.46	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) with amendment.	Reject	No
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.47	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Amend	Considers that HRZ-P14 should be amended, as multi-unit housing and other non-residential activities and building cannot require car parking as set out in the NPS-UD. Developments should provide adequate and appropriately located cycle and micromobility parking to align with infrastructure and transport objectives in the PDP.	Amend HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows: Only allow non-residential activities and buildings that: ... 6. Are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site. 7. <u>Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for cycle and micromobility parking and charging;</u> 8. <u>Adequate cycle facilities are accessible, secure, and covered (protected from weather)</u>	Reject	No
Woolworths New Zealand	359.43	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Amend	Considers that HRZ-P14 should be amended to clarify wording relative to the discretionary activity status of various non-residential activities and buildings provided for within the High Density Residential zone as restricted discretionary activities, and the provision of all other activities as discretionary activities.	Amend HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows: Only Allow non-residential activities and buildings that: 1. Support the needs of local communities; 2. Are of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone; 3. Contribute positively to the urban environment and achieve attractive and safe streets; 4. Reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle; 5. Maintain the safety and efficiency of the transport network; and 6. Are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site; 7. <u>Can demonstrate an operational or functional need to locate within the zone.</u>	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.35	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Support in part	Supports in part.	Retain HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings), with amendments.	Accept in Part	No
Waka Kotahi	370.351	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Amend	Considers that commercial activities should be encouraged and supported where appropriate and integrated with residential development.	Amend HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows: ... 1. Maintain the safety and efficiency of the transport network; and 2. Are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site; and 3. <u>are integrated into residential developments where possible</u>	Accept in Part	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.146	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as notified.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.38	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Support	Considers that HRZ-P14 will help enable facilities and services well suited to a residential setting.	Retain HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.459	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Support	Policy HRZ-P14 is generally supported.	Retain Policy HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as notified.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ministry of Education	400.1	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Support in part	Supports HRZ-P14 in part as it provides for non-residential activities in the HRZ.	Retain HRZ-P14 (Non-residential activities and buildings) with amendment.	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.101	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-P14	Amend	Seeks that HRZ-P14 be amended to ensure that additional infrastructure (including educational facilities) are explicitly recognised and provided for within the HRZ.	Amend HRZ (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows: Only allow non-residential activities and buildings that: ... 6. Are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site. 7. Provides additional infrastructure to support the needs of the community	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.381	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R1	Support	Considers that HRZ-R1 will help compensate for residents having less available green space, and provide for community building and public health, as well as potential infrastructure for green waste recycling at a local scale.	Retain HRZ-R1 (Community gardens) as notified.	Accept	No
VicLabour	414.34	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R1	Support	Supports provision for community gardens and urban agriculture and considers a green city and more community spaces is needed.	Retain HRZ-R1 (Community gardens) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	No
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R2	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain HRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as notified.	Reject	No
Khoi Phan	326.31	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend HRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. No more than three <u>ten</u> residential units occupy the site.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.352	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R2	Support in part	Supports provision for three dwellings per site.	Retain HRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) with amendments.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.353	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R2	Amend	Considers there may be opportunity to provide for higher densities as a permitted activity – such as four dwellings of up to four storeys subject to permitted activity standards and restricted discretionary activity status supported where that can't be achieved. Support notification preclusion where resource consent is required.	Amend HRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as follows: Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses Activity status: Permitted Where: No more than three <u>four</u> residential units occupy the site.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.382	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R2	Support	HRZ-R2 is supported as it will help enable facilities and services well suited to a residential setting.	Retain HRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.46	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R2	Support in part	Rule HRZ-R2 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Rule HRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.461	Residential Zones / High Density	Amend	Considers changes can be made to HRZ-R2 provide for better clarity in regard to the intention of the rule and notification preclusions and allow for a higher permitted activity threshold to allow for up	Amend Rule HRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as follows:	Reject	No
Onslow Residents Community Association	F580.34	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R2	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Disallow / Seeks to retain greater guarantees of proportionate and quality development than the unquantified terms proposed.	Accept	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.148	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ R2	Oppose	Considers the submission is more enabling than MDRS requirements without adequate justification.	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.383	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R3	Support	HRZ-R3 is supported as it will help enable businesses well suited to a residential setting.	Retain HRZ-R3 (Home business) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.462	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R3	Support in part	Rule HRZ-R3 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Rule HRZ-R3 (Home business) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.463	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to recognise changing urban environments and amenity in accordance with the NPSUD.	Amend Rule HRZ-R3.2 (Home business) as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of HRZ-R3.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent and effects of non-compliance with any requirement not met; and 2. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity adversely impacts on the <u>planned urban built form</u> amenity values of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood.	Reject	No
Craig Palmer	492.25	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R3	Support in part	Supports HRZ-R3 (Home business) facilitating individuals being able to conduct a business from their principal place of residence.	Retain HRZ-R3 (Home business) with amendment.	Reject	No
Craig Palmer	492.26	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that HRZ-R3 (Home business) should be amended to reduce the proposed numbers working and those visiting as they are out of proportion to a home-based business. Considers that the HRZ-R3 exception to exclusive residential use needs to be tailored to small and non-intrusive ventures that can be readily monitored. The right of neighbours to have quiet enjoyment at all times needs to be upheld as having paramount importance.	Amend HRZ-R3.1.b. (Home Business) as follows: ... b. No more than four three people in total work in the home business at any one time, and the maximum number of people on site associated with the home business does not exceed 10 6 people at any one time;	Reject	No
Craig Palmer	492.27	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that the MRZ-R3 exception to exclusive residential use needs to be tailored to small and non-intrusive ventures that can be readily monitored. The right of neighbours to have quiet enjoyment at all times needs to be upheld as having paramount importance.	Seeks that HRZ-R3 (Home Business) is amended to include the mandatory notification and consultation provisions of the Prostitution Reform Act 2003 need to be added as a caveat.	Reject	No
Craig Palmer	492.28	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that the HRZ-R3 exception to exclusive residential use needs to be tailored to small and non-intrusive ventures that can be readily monitored. The right of neighbours to have quiet enjoyment at all times needs to be upheld as having paramount importance.	Not specified.	Reject	No
Craig Palmer	492.29	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that the potential loss of tenancies for commercial property owners paying higher rates should be considered.	Seeks that HRZ-R3.2 (Home Business) is amended to include the potential loss of tenancies for commercial property owners paying higher rates as a matter of discretion. [inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R4	Oppose	Considers that should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the enabled activities policies and permitted land use activity rules applying to supported residential care activities in the Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Large Lot Residential and Corrections zones are retained as notified. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities. Such activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.	Retain HRZ-R4 (Supported residential care activities) as notified if "supported residential care activity" definition and references to term are retained.	Reject.	Yes.
Khoi Phan	326.32	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend HRZ-R4 (Supported residential care activities) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The maximum occupancy does not exceed 10 20 residents.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.384	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R4	Support	HRZ-R4 is supported as it will help enable facilities and services well suited to a residential setting.	Retain HRZ-R4 (Supported residential care activities) as notified.	Reject.	Yes.
Khoi Phan	326.33	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend HRZ-R5 (Boarding houses) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The maximum occupancy does not exceed 10 20 residents.	Reject	No
Airbnb	126.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R6	Support	Supports the approach to visitor accommodation in the residential zone.	Retain HRZ-R6 (Visitor Accommodation) as notified.	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.354	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R7	Amend	Considers the effects of larger scale activities of this nature should be assessed through a resource consent and the RD activity status for childcare activities exceeding 10 children at a time is considered appropriate. Traffic effects should be added as a matter of discretion as childcare activities can generate high volumes of traffic. In urban areas, childcare services should be located and designed to facilitate alternative transport modes – e.g located in densely populated areas with good walking connections. In addition, a matter of discretion should be included to support multi-use development, provision to include childcare facilities into residential developments where possible.	Amend HRZ-R7 (Child care services) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity may adversely impact on the amenity values of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood. 2. <u>The extent to which childcare facilities are integrated into residential development</u> 3. <u>Traffic generation and effects on the road network, and</u> 4. <u>How alternative modes will be supported.</u>	Accept in part	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.385	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R7	Support	HRZ-R7 is supported as it will help enable facilities and services well suited to a residential setting.	Retain HRZ-R7 (Child care services) as notified.	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.102	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R7	Support	Supports that the District Plan continues to outline exclusions for childcare facilities in relevant rules in residential zones.	Retain HRZ-R7 (Childcare services) as notified.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.179	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R8	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, and applications under this rule being precluded from being publicly notified. However, considers that retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity). Permitted activity status recognises that retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	Retain HRZ-R8 (Retirement village) and seeks amendment	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.180	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R8	Amend	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, and applications under this rule being precluded from being publicly notified. However, considers that retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity). Permitted activity status recognises that retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	Amend HRZ-R8 (Retirement village) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Permitted Matters of discretion are: 1- The matters in HRZ-P2, HRZ-P3 and HRZ-P7. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R8.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.355	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R8	Support	Support the restricted discretionary activity status for retirement villages provided that HRZ-P7 is revised to require consideration to multi-modal connectivity.	Retain as drafted, provided changes to HRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) is updated as per previous submission point.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.386	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R8	Support	HRZ-R8 is supported as it will help enable facilities and services well suited to a residential setting.	Retain HRZ-R8 (Retirement Village) as notified.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.356	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R9	Support in part	Supports in part	Retain HRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) with amendments.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.357	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R9	Amend	Considers in interests of amenity and services for urban environments, Waka Kotahi considers that commercial activities should be included as a restricted discretionary activity. Access to appropriately located and scaled commercial activities improves amenity for residents in urban environments and creates for walkable environments. Waka Kotahi supports this rule provided that commercial services are included and HRZ-P14 is revised to include provision for integrated residential developments.	Amend HRZ-R9 Community facility, commercial activity , health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.387	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R9	Support	HRZ-R9 is supported as it will help enable facilities and services well suited to a residential setting.	Retain HRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.464	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule HRZ-R9 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Rule HRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.465	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R9	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to recognise changing urban environments and amenity in accordance with the NPSUD. Small scale commercial activities, such as cafes, convenience stores, and hairdressers, provide amenity to residents in a walkable urban setting and increase the vibrancy of an area. Operating thresholds have been incorporated to ensure such activities do not detract from the underlying residential environment.	Amend Rule HRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) as follows: Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding childcare services) and Commercial activities 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where commercial activities: a. Are limited to the ground floor tenancy of an apartment building; b. Have a gross floor area that does not exceed 200m² c. Have hours of operation between: i. 7.00am and 9.00pm Monday to Friday; and ii. 8.00am and 7.00pm Saturday, Sunday and public holidays. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in HRZ-P14. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R9.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.	Reject	No
Ministry of Education	400.103	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R9	Support in part	Support HRZ-R9 in part.	Retain HRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) with amendment.	Accept	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ministry of Education	400.104	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R9	Amend	Seeks HRZ-R9 be amended to replace 'education facilities' with 'educational facilities' to keep definitions consistent throughout the plan.	Amend HRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) as follows: Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, educational facility (excluding child care services) 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in HRZ-P14. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R9.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.	Accept	No
Braydon White	146.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for HRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.	Reject	No
Woolworths New Zealand	359.44	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R10	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain HRZ-R10 (All other activities) as notified.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.358	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R10	Support	Support discretionary activity status for activities not provided for so that the effects of incompatible activities can be assessed and managed.	Retain HRZ-R10 (All other activities) as notified.	Accept	No
Jonathan Markwick	490.27	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for HRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled or Restricted Discretionary. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.198	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R11	Support	Supports the rule as the maintenance and repair of buildings and structures within the HRZ are a permitted activity.	Retain HRZ-R11 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.199	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R12	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the HRZ are a permitted activity.	Retain HRZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.258	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R12	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain HRZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.259	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R12	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend HRZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.	Reject	No
Khoi Phan	326.34	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend the title of HRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three ten residential units occupy the site	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.359	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Support in part	Supports construction of residential buildings as a permitted activity subject to standards. Also supports the Restricted Discretionary Activity Status where permitted activity status is not met.	Retain HRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) with amendments.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.360	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Amend	Considers that the permitted density should be increased to better align with the outcomes of the NPS-UD.	Amend HRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three ten <u>four</u> residential units occupy the site.	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.146	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ R13	Oppose	Considers the original submission is more enabling than MDRS requirements without adequate justification. [Inferred reference to 370.360]	Disallow	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.466	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Support in part	Rule HRZ-R13 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Rule HRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.467	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Amend	Considers that an amendment is required to the title of HRZ-R13 to apply to all buildings not just those associated with no more than three residential units on a site. Considers that the permitted standard should also be expanded to six residential units as the HDZ should provide for a greater number of dwellings than the MRZ given that a greater intensity of dwellings are anticipated in this Zone. A further amendment is sought to delete reference to HRZ-P10.	Amend Rule HRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site. 1. Activity Status: Permitted where: <u>a. There are no more than six residential units on a site; and</u> a). Compliance with the following standards is achieved: ... 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of HRZ-R13.1.a and HRZ-R13.1.b cannot be <u>are not</u> achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard; and 2. The matters in HRZ-P2, HRZ-P3, HRZ-P4, HRZ-P5, HRZ-P8, HRZ-P9, HRZ-P10 and HRZ-P11; <u>and</u> 3. <u>where compliance with HRZ-R13.1.a is not achieved the matters in HRZ-P6.</u> Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R13.2.a which results from non-compliance with HRZ-S1, HRZ-S3, MRZ-S4 or MRZ-S5 is precluded from being publicly notified.	Reject	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.121	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Amend	Considers that for health and safety reasons, a setback for structures from the rail corridor boundary is sought. While KiwiRail do not oppose development on adjacent sites, ensuring the ability to access and maintain structures without requiring access to rail land is important. KiwiRail seek amendment to this rule to ensure compliance with the requested rail corridor boundary setback standard (HRZ-S4) is required.	Amend HRZ-R13.1 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance with the following standards is achieved: i. HRZ-S1; ii. HRZ-S3; iii. HRZ-S4 only in relation to the rear yard <u>and rail corridor</u> boundary setbacks;_ iv.	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.34	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners.	Disallow	Reject	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.122	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Amend	Considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with. This amendment is sought in addition to the amendment sought in relation to HRZ-R13.1.	Amend HRZ-R13.2 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirement of HRZ-R13.1.a cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. ... 2. ... 3. <u>The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u>	Accept	Yes
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.35	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners.	Disallow	Reject	No
Rachel Underwood	458.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R13	Amend	Considers inappropriate to include the standards for setbacks and side yards when implementing HRZ-R13.	Seeks to amend HRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: Compliance with the following standards is achieved: HRZ-S1; HRZ-S3; HRZ-S4 only in relation to the rear yard boundary setback; HRZ-S5... [inferred decision requested].	Accept	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Stratum Management Limited	249.21	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Amend	The non-notification statement for this rule precludes public notification. Given that any multi-unit development is subject to this rule, and that it specifies a range of standards that apply to multi-unit development, where a proposal meets these standards, it should be processed on a non-notified basis.	Amend the notification status under HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) by adding the following: <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14.1 that meets the standards specified is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u>	Accept in part	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.210	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought by The RVA in relation to MRZ-R14 and HRZ-R14.	Accept	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.210	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought by Ryman in relation to MRZ-R14 and HRZ-R14.	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.144	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Amend	Considers the notification clauses for 4 or more household units need to align with Sch 3A, cl 5 of the RMA. This also needs to reflect the building standards	Amend the notification clause of HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being publicly notified. <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14.1 which results from non-compliance with HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S4 or HMRZ-S5 is precluded from being publicly notified.</u> <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14.1 which results from non-compliance with HRZ-S12, HRZ-S13 or HRZ-S14 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u>	Accept in part	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.242	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission in so far as it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought in The RVA's primary submission.	Accept	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.242	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission in so far as it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.	Accept	No
Khol Phan	326.35	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: 1. Activity status: <u>Restricted-Discretionary Permitted</u> ...	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.181	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Support in part	Supports the construction of buildings or structures for a retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under HRZ-R14. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 1 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the height, height in relation to boundary, minimum privacy separation to a boundary for a retirement village, and minimum building separation distance for a retirement village standards. Considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 2, are not appropriate except for the reference to HRZ-P7 (subject to the submission points on that policy). The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Opposes the inclusion of the Clause 3 matters of discretion relating to the City Outcomes Contribution for the reasons provided in response to HRZ-P13. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects provided by retirement villages, the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. Support applications made under HRZ-R14 being precluded from being publicly notified, but Considers that if a retirement village is compliant with HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S15, HRZ-S16 and HRZ-S17 it should also be precluded from limited notification	Retain HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and seeks amendment	Accept in part	Yes
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.182	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Amend	Supports the construction of buildings or structures for a retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under HRZ-R14. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in	Amend HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows:	Accept in part	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.183	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Oppose in part	Supports the construction of buildings or structures for a retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under HRZ-R14. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 1 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the height, height in relation to boundary, minimum privacy separation to a boundary for a retirement village, and minimum building separation distance for a retirement village standards. Considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 2, are not appropriate except for the reference to HRZ-P7 (subject to the submission points on that policy). The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Opposes the inclusion of the Clause 3 matters of discretion relating to the City Outcomes Contribution for the reasons provided in response to HRZ-P13. Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects provided by retirement villages, the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites. Support applications made under HRZ R14 being precluded from being publicly notified, but Considers that if a retirement village is compliant with HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S15, HRZ-S16 and HRZ-S17 it should also be precluded from limited notification	Opposes HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and seeks amendment	Accept in part	Yes
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	350.184	Residential Zones / High Density	Amend	Supports the construction of buildings or structures for a retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under HRZ-R14. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in	Amend HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows:	Accept in part	Yes
Waka Kotahi	370.361	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Support in part	Restricted Discretionary Activity status is supported for construction of multi-unit houses, subject to our submission points on standards, objectives, and policies referred to in the rule.	Retain HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) with amendments to submission points made in relation to points made on standards, objectives, and policies.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.468	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Support in part	Rule HRZ-R14 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Rule HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.469	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Amend	Considers that amendments to HRZ-R14 are required to preclude limited notification for developments that comply with the relevant standards. Opposes the including of multi-unit housing as this can be managed through HRZ-R13 in accordance with the amendments sought to that rule.	Amend Rule HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: Construction of buildings for multi-unit housing or a retirement village 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any of the follow standards as specified in the associated assessment criteria for any infringed standard: i. HRZ-S2; ii. HRZ-S3; iii. HRZ-S12 for multi-unit housing only; iv. HRZ-S13 for multi-unit housing only; v. HRZ-S14 for multi-unit housing only; vi. HRZ-S15; vii. HRZ-S16; and viii. HRZ-S17. 2. The matters in HRZ-P2, HRZ-P3, HRZ-P5, HRZ-P6, HRZ-P7, HRZ-P8, HRZ-P10 and HRZ-P11. 3. The matters in HRZ-P13 where the development comprises 25 or more residential units; or exceeds the maximum height requirement by 25% or more. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being publicly notified. An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14 that complies with the relevant standards is precluded from public and limited notification.	Accept in part	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.142	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it aligns with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission on HRZ-R14 and HRZ-R17.	Accept in part	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.142	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it aligns with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission on HRZ-R14 and HRZ-R17.	Accept in part	No
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.40	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Amend	Considers that since this rule makes all multi-unit housing a RD activity and refers back to broad policies as matters of discretion, Council's scope is too broad for an RD activity. Considers this may risk failing to meet S77B, and Council is already required to consider relevant policies under 104(1)(b).	Amend HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) to: 2. The matters in HRZ-P2, HRZ-P3, HRZ-P5, HRZ-P6, HRZ P7, HRZ-P8, HRZ-P10 and HRZ-P11.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.41	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Amend	Considers that preclusion from public notification only does not comply with Clause 5(2) of Schedule 3A, which requires both limited and public notification be excluded for any resource consent for 4+ units that comply with the MDRS.	Amend HRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) to: Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being publicly notified. <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being limited notified where the proposal complies with HRZ-S2 to HRZ-S9.</u> <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being limited notified where the proposal complies with HRZ-S2 to HRZ-S5 and HRZ-S12 to HRZ-S17.</u>	Accept in part	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.212	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought by The RVA in relation to MRZ-R14 and HRZ-R14.	Accept in part	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.212	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R14	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought by Ryman in relation to MRZ-R14 and HRZ-R14.	Accept in part	No
Wellington City Council	266.145	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R16	Amend	Considers a change to this rule is required to provide for small structures on legal road (up to 1.5m high) as a Permitted Activity. Considers this will reduce consenting requirements. It is noted that structures on legal road are covered by the encroachment licence process. There is a consequential amendment to update the Restricted Discretionary rule.	Amend HRZ-R16 as follows: HRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) ... <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. It is a retaining wall of less than 1.5m in height above ground level.</u> 2. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Where: 1. Compliance with any of the requirements of HRZ-R16.1.a cannot be achieved, (-)</u>	Accept	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.200	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R16	Support in part	Supports the rule as the development on or over a legal road is a restricted discretionary activity and which must ensure that highway access and safety is maintained for all road users. Fire and Emergency relies on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network to respond to emergency call outs. It is therefore critical that buildings and structures on legal roads do not hinder the ability for FENZ to respond to emergency call outs effectively and efficiently for firefighting and other rescue operations. A further matter of discretion is therefore sought	Supports HRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road), with amendment.	Accept	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.201	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R16	Amend	Supports the rule as the development on or over a legal road is a restricted discretionary activity and which must ensure that highway access and safety is maintained for all road users. Fire and Emergency relies on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network to respond to emergency call outs. It is therefore critical that buildings and structures on legal roads do not hinder the ability for FENZ to respond to emergency call outs effectively and efficiently for firefighting and other rescue operations. A further matter of discretion is therefore sought	Amend HRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are restricted to: ... 3. Maintaining safe access and safety for road users, including pedestrians; and 4. The matters in HRZ-P8, HRZ-P10 and HRZ-P11; and 5. <u>Maintaining the ability for emergency services, including fire appliances, to access the property for firefighting purposes.</u>	Accept	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.39	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R16	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow	Reject	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.39	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R16	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.362	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R16	Support in part	Rule HRZ-R16 is supported, but amendment is sought	Retain Rule HRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Waka Kotahi	370.363	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R16	Amend	Considers that amendments to Rule HRZ-R16 are required to ensure visibility over the road corridor.	Amend Rule HRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Where the legal road is controlled by Waka Kotahi, written approval has been provided from Waka Kotahi authorising the building or structure.</u> Matters of discretion are:	Accept in Part	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.470	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R16	Support	Rule HRZ-R16 is supported.	Retain HRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as notified.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.202	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R17	Support	Supports the rule as the addition or alteration to buildings and structures within the HRZ is provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity.	Retain HRZ-R17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) as notified.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.185	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R17	Support in part	Supports additions and alterations to a retirement village being provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under HRZ-R17. The RVA considers the matters of discretion need to align with those for new requirement villages. Supports HRZ-R17.2a being precluded from being publicly notified, but in accordance with Schedule 3A(5)(s) of the Act Considers that alterations and additions to retirement villages that are compliant with HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3, HRZ S15, HRZ-S16 and HRZ-S17 should also be precluded from limited notification.	Retain HRZ-R17.2 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) and seeks amendment	Accept in part	Yes
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.186	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R17	Amend	Supports additions and alterations to a retirement village being provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under HRZ-R17. The RVA considers the matters of discretion need to align with those for new requirement villages. Supports HRZ-R17.2a being precluded from being publicly notified, but in accordance with Schedule 3A(5)(s) of the Act Considers that alterations and additions to retirement villages that are compliant with HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3, HRZ S15, HRZ-S16 and HRZ-S17 should also be precluded from limited notification.	Amend HRZ-R17.2 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) as follows: 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: ... 2. The matters in HRZ-P9, HRZ-P10, HRZ-P11 and HRZ-P14 (<u>this clause is not applicable o retirement villages</u>); and 3. The matters in HRZ-P6, HRZ-P7 and HRZ-P8 for additions and alterations to multi-unit-housing; or a retirement village; and 4. For additions and alterations to retirement villages: i. <u>The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> ii. <u>The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u> iii. <u>The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> iv. <u>When assessing the matters in 1(a)(i) – (v), and 2(a)(4)(i) – (iii), consider:</u> a. <u>The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u> b. <u>The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u> v. <u>The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u> For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule HRZ-R17.2. a is precluded from being publicly notified. <u>An application for resource consent for additions and alterations to a retirement village where compliance is achieved with HRZ-S2, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S15 and HRZ-S17 is precluded from being limited notified.</u>	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.471	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R17	Support in part	Rule HRZ-R17 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Rule HRZ-R17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.472	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R17	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to remove reference to policies which are opposed and reference to residential units, multi-unit housing and retirement villages.	Amend HRZ-R17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance with the following standards is achieved: i. HRZ-S1; ii. HRZ-S2; iii. HRZ-S3; iv. HRZ-S4; v. HRZ-S5; vi. HRZ-S10; and vii. HRZ-S12; viii. HRZ-S13; ix. HRZ-S14; x. HRZ-S15; xi. HRZ-S16; and xii. HRZ-S17. 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary where: a. Compliance is not achieved with any of the requirements of HRZ-R17.1.a cannot be achieved . Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard; 2. The matters in HRZ-P9, HRZ-P10 , HRZ-P11 and HRZ-P14; and 3. The matters in HRZ-P6 , HRZ-P7 and HRZ-P8 for additions and alterations to multi-unit housing or a retirement village.	Accept in part	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.143	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R17	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it aligns with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission on HRZ-R14 and HRZ-R17.	Accept	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.143	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-R17	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it aligns with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission on HRZ-R14 and HRZ-R17.	Accept	No
Peter Preston	42.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	Considers that HRZ-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structures) does not adequately take account of areas where 21m high buildings with 5 metre boundaries are permitted up against Character Precincts, Heritage Areas, Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct or Character Precinct-extension areas proposed by Mt Victoria Historical Society. Afternoon sun may be blocked from these properties. Degradation and abandonment of these properties may ultimately occur as their heritage or character may be visually destroyed. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone of at least one property wide be required between any Character Precinct or heritage area border and a High Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No
Kirsty Wood	109.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that PDP doesn't take into account HRZ zoning bordering character precincts. Considers that HRZ zoning next to character precincts or heritage areas will ruin the character/heritage. Considers that the HRZ zoning will result in blocked afternoon sun in a number of locations. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone of at least one property wide be required between any Character Precinct border or Heritage Area border and a High Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that PDP doesn't take into account HRZ zoning bordering character precincts. Considers that HRZ zoning next to character precincts or heritage areas will ruin the character/heritage. Considers that the HRZ zoning will result in blocked afternoon sun in a number of locations. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone of at least one property wide be required between any Character Precinct border or Heritage Area border and a High Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No
LIVE WELLington	154.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that shading effects on parks may occur not just with adjacent buildings as buildings on sites further away may also cause shading.	Seeks amendment to the assessment criteria of HRZ-S1 (Building height control where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. Streetscape and visual amenity effects; 2. Dominance, privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites; and 3. Effects on the function and associated amenity values of any adjacent open space zone <u>within 50 metres</u> .	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Glen Scanlon	212.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that this does not rule out higher buildings but it does mean there is due process for such projects [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that height limits are decreased from 21m to 8m where the landscape begins to rise in Mount Victoria.	Reject	No
Glen Scanlon	212.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that steep elevation and close elevation already limits sunlight access to their property. Considers that lowering heights in these areas would align with Hawker Street. Considers that this does not rule out higher buildings but it does mean there is due process for such projects Considers that 21m height can theoretically be built right next door with little consideration for sunlight access beyond "Adequate sunlight access" which has no guidance. Considers that construction of large buildings would require purchasing many properties in the area with major earthworks to provide suitable platforms. The costs will be high, infrastructure will be under pressure and it's a high wind zone - the PDP does not account for these. As a result, properties will be expensive. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the height control in Earls Terrace, Port Street and Stafford Street are amended from 21m to 11m.	Accept in Part	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.146	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	Considers there is a need to amend exemptions to HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) to enable minor building height limit intrusions.	Amend HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) exemptions as follows: (...) This standard does not apply to: a. Fences or standalone walls;- b. <u>Solar panel and heating components attached to a building provided these do not exceed the height by more than 500mm;</u> c. <u>Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m measured vertically;</u> d. <u>Multi-unit housing; and e. Retirement villages.</u>	Accept	Yes
Everard Aspell	270.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Not specified	Considers that allowing building heights of 11-21 metres in the inner city suburbs of Mount Victoria, Mount Cook, Thorndon, Berhampore, Newtown and Aro Valley will create shading, privacy issues, loss of green areas, reduced property values; will forever change the streetscape and will not reflect the character of the area.	Seeks that intensification is restricted to brownfield sites.	Reject	No
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.111	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Support	Part 3 of WCC's summary: ... intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage. ... the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook. There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.	Allow	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.203	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations i is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	Supports HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site), with amendment.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.204	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations i is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	Amend HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... a. Fences or standalone walls; and b. <u>Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>	Reject	No
Marilyn Powell	281.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	Considers that for WCC to permit high rise dwellings will mean demolition destruction of well-maintained wooden heritage housing stock and insertion of concrete and glass. Inserting just one such high-rise will affect negatively the surrounding wooden housing, causing shading and weatherboard deterioration.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.73	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Support	TRA support these submissions insofar as they underpin the reasons to change the Hobson residential are from HDZ to MDZ and to create a Character Precinct over the block.	Allow	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Phillippa O'Connor	289.32	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the Western Side of Kelburn Parade, especially #64 Kelburn Parade should have maximum building height increased because: - It is close to the transport network, employment opportunities and social infrastructure. - Larger building heights would support additional housing for the benefit of those utilising the university. [See original submission for full details]	Seeks that Standard HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1) is amended so that the western side of Kelburn Parade has a maximum height limit of 21m as a permitted activity.	Reject	No
Phillippa O'Connor	289.33	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	Considers this dual-standard approach is unnecessary, and that the more permissive height standard in the MRZ should be enabled irrespective of scale of the development.	Seeks that standards HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) and HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) building height control are combined so that there are not different height standards for 1-3 residential units and multi unit developments.	Accept in part	Yes
Khoi Phan	326.36	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S1 should be amended so that structures do not exceed 15 metres in height and the 15 degree slope are removed.	Amend HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1) as follows: 1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 11 15 metres in height above ground level, except that 50% of a building's roof in elevation, measured vertically from the junction between wall and roof, may exceed this height by 1 metre, where the entire roof slopes 15° or more, as shown in Diagram 5 below:	Accept in part	Yes
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	The 6-storey height limit at 35 to 61 Hankey Street is not supported, as these properties are along the ridgeline, steeply sloped, and already suffer from poor pedestrian and vehicle access.	Remove High Density Residential Zoning at 35 to 61 Hankey Street.	Accept in Part	Yes
Kerry Finnigan	336.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that early 1900s houses in Newtown will have no protection from being shaded by 6-storey buildings and may lose their privacy and value by being exposed to a possible "visual pollution" in the neighbourhood. These houses are the main assets of many residents in Newtown who put in work, money and time to upgrade and maintain their character.	Seeks that areas in proximity to early 1900s houses in Newtown not be zoned High Density Residential. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in Part	Yes
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	F568.37	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Support	Supports submission that seeks to extend character precincts.	Allow	Accept in Part	Yes
Waka Kotahi	370.364	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Support in part	Standard HRZ-S1 is supported, but amendment is sought.	Retain Standard HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) with amendments.	Accept in part	Yes
Waka Kotahi	370.365	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S1 should be amended to enable greater densities (heights and number of dwellings) to promote a more urban form. Considers that dwellings of this scale that comply with the permitted activity standards should not require resource consent and be better aligned with the outcomes of the NPS-UD.	Amend Standard HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows: Building height control 1 where no more than three four residential units occupy the site 1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 11 14 metres in height above ground level, except that 50% of a building's roof in elevation, measured vertically from the junction between wall and roof, may exceed this height by 1 metre, where the entire roof slopes 15° or more, as shown in Diagram 5 below:	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.473	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Support in part	Standard HRZ-S1 is generally supported, but amendments are sought.	Retain Standard HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) and seeks amendment.	Accept in Part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.474	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to allow this standard to apply to all residential units regardless of how many are on a site and to be more enabling for residential units located within	Amend Standard HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows:	Reject	No
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	F537.19	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension – limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow	Accept	No
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	F538.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes elements of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow	Accept	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.16	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	Considers the proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Medium Density Residential Standards and would enable an unjustified level of development. Considers there is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary. Considers original submission contains the submitter's view of appropriate settings for our community. [Refer to original submission - 283]	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.104	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	The proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the NPS-UD and MDRS and would enable an unjustified level of development. There is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary.	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.33	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Accept	No
Don Mackay	FS94.19	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow	Accept	No
LIVE WELLington	FS96.35	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	We opposed amendments to standard HRZ-S1 to increase building height controls within given distances of CCZ, MCZ and Town Centre Zones. The proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the NPS-UD and MDRS and would enable an unjustified level of development. There is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary	Disallow	Accept	No
Roland Sapsford	FS117.34	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	Roland Sapsford opposed amendments to standard HRZ-S1 to increase building height controls within given distances of CCZ, MCZ and Town Centre Zones. The proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the NPS-UD and MDRS and would enable an unjustified level of development. There is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary.	Disallow	Accept	No
Donna Yule	421.4	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes the blanket policy of Medium Density 3 Storey Residential housing in all residential areas - the height limits are too high. Considers that no consideration has been given to the geographical location of each individual suburb, its terrain and orientation to the sun. For suburbs that are built in a north south direction with hills either side and the main housing is on the flat, any 3 storey building will cast a significant shadow over many properties. Many more 3 storey development means a whole suburb except for those on the hills will be in permanent shadows. Added to that no space between properties, no outside areas to enjoy a little privacy. These suburbs will become sunless undesirable transitional suburbs where people will only stay a short time until they can afford to move elsewhere with sun & outdoor space.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Gregory Webber	33.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Oppose	Opposes six storey buildings in Green Street and believes that two-three storey housing is acceptable.	Amend the 21m height limit at HRZ-S2	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.219	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
Greg Coyle	39.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Oppose	Opposes six storey height limit in Newtown	Not specified	No decision requested	No
M J & P B Murtagh	98.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Amend	Considers that the 21m height standard for Mount Victoria should be reduced.	Seeks that the 21m height limit specified at HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) is reduced in relation to Mount Victoria.	Reject	No
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Oppose	Opposes HRZ-S2 height limit of 21m with regards to Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood. Considers that an 11m height limit will help preserve the unique character of the area. Lower Kelburn is not suitable for 21m height limit because of steep and narrow access, hilly and deeply indented physical character which would require significant infrastructural development to intensify. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Opposes HRZ-S2 (Height Controls for multi unit housing or a retirement village) with regards to 6 storey building height in Lower Kelburn	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Everard Aspell	270.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Not specified	Considers that allowing building heights of 11-21 metres in the inner city suburbs of Mount Victoria, Mount Cook, Thorndon, Berhampore, Newtown and Aro Valley will create shading, privacy issues, loss of green areas, reduced property values; will forever change the streetscape and will not reflect the character of the area.	Seeks that intensification is restricted to brownfield sites.	Reject	No
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.112	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Support	Part of WCC's summary: ... intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage. ... the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook. There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.	Allow	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.205	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Support in part	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	Supports HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village), with amendment.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.206	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Amend	Seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	Amend HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... b. Solar panel and heating components attached to a building provided these do not exceed the height by more than 500mm; c. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m.; and d. Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.	Reject	No
Marilyn Powell	281.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Oppose	Considers that for WCC to permit high rise dwellings will mean demolition destruction of well-maintained wooden heritage housing stock and insertion of concrete and glass. Inserting just one such high-rise will affect negatively the surrounding wooden housing, causing shading and weatherboard deterioration.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.74	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Support	TRA support these submissions insofar as they underpin the reasons to change the Hobson residential are from HDZ to MDZ and to create a Character Precinct over the block.	Allow	Reject	No
Phillippa O'Connor	289.34	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Amend	Considers that the Western Side of Kelburn Parade, especially #64 Kelburn Parade should have maximum building height increased because: - It is close to the transport network, employment opportunities and social infrastructure. - Larger building heights would support additional housing for the benefit of those utilising the university. [See original submission for full details]	Seeks that Standard HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2) is amended so that the western side of Kelburn Parade has a maximum height limit of 21m as a permitted activity.	Reject	No
Phillippa O'Connor	289.35	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Oppose	Considers this dual-standard approach is unnecessary, and that the more permissive height standard in the MRZ should be enabled irrespective of scale of the development.	Seeks that standards HRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) and HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) building height control are combined so that there are not different height standards for 1-3 residential units and multi unit developments.	Reject	No
Hilary Watson	321.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Oppose in part	Considers that Building Height Control 2 is inadequate for properties surrounding Carrara Park. The park serves a large community of people of all ages who live nearby, some of whom are in social housing and apartments with little outdoor space. Carrara Park is a precious resource for the community, heavily used in the afternoon when the sun comes from the northwest and west, an area inappropriately zoned in the PDP at 21 metres. The new three storey block on Regent St already casts shade on the park in the morning at certain times of the year.	Oposes HRZ-S2 in relation to properties around Carrara Park being classified under Building Height Control 2 in HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village).	Accept	Yes
Khoi Phan	326.37	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2) as follows: 1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 24 30 metres in height above ground level. ... Seeks that High Density Residential Zones in Mount Cook not be directly adjacent to Character Precincts.	Accept in Part	Yes
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Amend	Considers that 21 metres heights, or 6 stories, is too tall for the whole Mt Cook area given much of the suburb should be captured within the character area per the findings of the Boffa Miskell report. 21-metre areas adjoining designated character areas could create towering buildings dominating the neighbourhood. Furthermore, such heights will cause neighbouring properties to become shadier, damper, less healthy and unpleasant to live in, with risks of blocking sunlight and solar energy production.	Seeks that High Density Residential Zones in Mount Cook not be directly adjacent to Character Precincts.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.102	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZS2	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington.	Disallow	Accept	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.187	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Support	Supports HRZ-S2 and the additional building height that it enables for retirement villages.	Retain HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as notified.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.366	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Support in part	Supports the direction to enable a range of housing types and densities in the High Density residential Zone.	Retain Standard HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) with amendment.	Accept in Part	Yes
Waka Kotahi	370.367	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Amend	Considers that enabling up to twelve stories is appropriate in certain areas where the density is supported by services.	Amend Standard HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: 1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 24 22 metres in height above ground level. This standard does not apply to: a. Fences or standalone walls; b. Solar panel and heating components attached to a building provided these do not exceed the height by more than 500mm; and c. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m. Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. Streetscape and visual amenity effects; 2. Dominance, privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites; 3. Effects on the function and associated amenity values of any adjacent open space zone; and 4. Wind effects; and 5. <u>Contribution to built urban form and outcomes sought under the NPS-UD.</u>	Accept in Part	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.475	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Oppose	Opposes the provision of two entirely separate height standards seeks an amendment to HRZ-S1 to allow that standard to cover all areas and provide for greater height limits close to train stations and centres. [As detailed above].	Delete HRZ-S2 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) in its entirety as notified.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.34	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZS1	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Accept	No
Investore Property Limited	405.56	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Support	Supports the provision of a broad area of six storey High Density Residential zoning in the wider Johnsonville catchment. Submitter considers that this gives effect to the NPS-UD and reflects the status of Johnsonville as a Metropolitan Centre.	Retain HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as notified. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.84	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Amend	Submitter considers that there should be further scope for development above the façade height, e.g. plant rooms, sloping roofs, etc. The submitter considers that is the view from the street which is the greatest concern (i.e. the height of the parapet). The submitter considers that the way the current height limits are drafted encourages a 'flat haircut' style of building and limits potential roof designs.	Amend HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: 1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 21 metres in height above ground level. This standard does not apply to: ... b. Solar panel and heating components attached to a building provided these do not exceed the height by more than 500mm; and c. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m; d. <u>Circumstances where up to 50% of a building's roof in elevation exceeds the maximum height where the entire roof slopes 15° or more; or</u> e. <u>Circumstances where, in respect of flat roofs or roofs sloping less than 15°, non-habitable rooms (such as plant rooms) and other roof-top structures may exceed the height, provided those structures are set back from the leading edge of the parapet by at least 2 metres and do not exceed 50% of the overall roof area.</u> ... [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part	Yes
Jonathan Markwick	490.28	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Support	Supports the increase in height controls in the "Kelburn North" area.	Retain HRZ-S2 (Maximum height) around Kelburn North as notified.	Reject	No
Jonathan Markwick	490.29	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S2	Support	Supports the increase in height controls in the Hobson Street, Hobson Crescent and Moturoa Street (Thorndon) area.	Retain the High Density Residential Zoning (21m) for Hobson Street, Hobson Crescent and Moturoa Street as notified.	Accept in Part	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Judith Graykowski	80.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) is very limited and simply not adequate.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Ann Mallinson	81.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Not specified	Considers that developers should not be allowed to build without a requirement not to intrude on the sunlight of neighbouring buildings. The extra heating that will be used by the affected buildings will badly affect our carbon emissions.	Not Specified.	No decision requested	No
Joanna Newman	85.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) does not adequately take account of areas where 21m or 28.5m buildings are permitted up against character precincts, heritage areas, Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct or Character Precinct-extension areas proposed by Mt Victoria Historical Society. Considers that allowing buildings of heights with 5 metre boundaries will destroy heritage or character from a visual point of view and lead to degradation of such properties. [See original submission for further detail] Supports evidence submitted by the Mt Victoria Historical Society.	Seeks that a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone of at least one property wide be required between any Character Precinct or heritage area border and a High Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No
Interprofessional Trust	96.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Oppose	Considers that recession plane requirements should be removed from the PDP.	Seeks that HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) is deleted.	Reject	No
Gael Webster	114.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) does not adequately take account of areas where 21m or 28.5m high buildings are permitted up against Character Precincts, Heritage Areas, Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct or Character Precinct-extension areas proposed by Mt Victoria Historical Society. Considers that allowing buildings of such heights with a 5 metre height to boundary will destroy the heritage or character from a visual point of view and reduce the well-being of residents due to insufficient light and sunshine, and will likely lead to degradation and abandonment of these properties.	Seeks that a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone at least one property wide is required between any Character Precinct or Heritage Area border and a High Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No
Vivienne Morrell	155.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) is very limited and simply not adequate, given that HRZ buildings can go right to site boundaries.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Oppose	Considers that HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) does not adequately take account of areas where 21m or 28.5m buildings are permitted up against character precincts, heritage areas, Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct or Character Precinct-extension areas proposed by Mt Victoria Historical Society.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Pauletta Wilson	257.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that the plan has very limited controls to manage shading and sunshine and that these are not adequate given buildings in the new high density zone can go right to site boundaries.	Seeks that HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) is amended to limit the shading of private properties beyond the controls that are in the plan already.	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.147	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers there is a need to amend exemptions to HRZ-S3.	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) exemptions as follows: (...) This standard does not apply to: a. (...) b. (...) c. (...)- d. <u>Solar panel and heating components attached to a building provided these do not exceed the height by more than 500mm; and</u> e. <u>Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m measured vertically.</u>	Accept	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.207	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Support in part	As per previous submission points, FENZ seeks an exemption for hose drying towers regarding height in relation to boundary standards	Supports HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary), with amendment.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.208	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	As per previous submission points, FENZ seeks an exemption for hose drying towers regarding height in relation to boundary standards	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... b. Existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site; and c. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; <u>and</u> d. <u>Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Phillippa O'Connor	289.36	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that at 21m, a maximum height to boundary of 8m plus 60 degrees is onerous and renders future development of smaller sites in particular likely unable to achieve maximum height.	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: 2. For any site where HRZ-S2 applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 8-19 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries, except where (3) or (4) below is applicable .	Reject	No
James Coyle	307.16	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S3 is not suitable to be applied around Carrara Park for the following reasons: - The shallow depth of the park in the North South Direction make it susceptible for shading. - The location of amenities close to the Western Boundary are susceptible to shading. - The equinox is not a suitable measure to shading as the sun angle is still high. - The mixture of HRZ and MRZ zones around the park further complicates and adds risk to shading, there is no guidance on MRZ for open space. - Winter sun has significant shading potential. - There are little accessible parks in Newtown. A hatched zone measured by the winter solstice sunrise to sunset angles should be created. All properties in this zone need a 45deg recession plane measured from 2m above ground at the boundary. The point of measurement should be from the southwest boundary corner and the South east boundary corner. [Refer to attachment]	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) around Carrara Park in Newtown to require properties to have a 45 degree recession plane measured from 2m above ground at the boundary.	Reject	No
James Coyle	307.17	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that Carrara Park should be protected for development to the East / North / West. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Carrara Park be protected for development to the East, North and West.	Reject	No
Philip O'Reilly and Julie Saddington	310.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	HRZ-S3 does not provide any protection of the amenity effects on character precinct and should be amended to have an additional sub-point. The policy as it stands will result in large buildings creating significant effects on neighbouring character areas, eroding their special character values.	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: ... 3. For any site where HRZ-S2 applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 5 metres vertically above ground level along any boundary that adjoins a site in: i. The Medium Density Residential Zone; or ii. The Wellington Town Belt Zone; or iii. Any Heritage Area; or iv. Any site containing a Heritage Building; or v. Any site occupied by a school; or vi. <u>Any Character Precinct</u> .	Accept	Yes
Hilary Watson	321.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that the upzoning of 73.2 percent of Newtown as HRZ is not respectful of the City's historic heritage and will result in the irretrievable loss of character, distinctiveness and identity across the suburb, including Character Precincts. The HRZ in the area will not effectively achieve the strategic direction supporting the creation of a liveable, well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing, as well as their health and safety. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks to reduce the extent of the High Density Residential Zone in Newtown. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in Part	Yes
Hilary Watson	321.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S3.4 provides inadequate height zoning for properties around Carrara Park in Newtown. The provision does not provide sufficient sun access to the park and is too limited in the way it relates to the properties surrounding Carrara Park in Newtown. Properties surrounding Carrara Park should have appropriate setbacks and roof planes so that the park gets maximum possible sun all year round.	Seeks that the properties bordering Carrara Park have appropriate setbacks and roof planes so that the park gets maximum possible sun all year round.	Reject	No
Khoi Phan	326.38	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Delete HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) in its entirety.	Reject	No
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S3 is inadequate, given buildings can go right up to site boundaries. Design requirements for multi-unit residential developments need to be strengthened to future-proof buildings and provide for good community experience.	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) to better future-proof buildings and provide for good community experience.	Reject	No
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that adjacent property owners, particularly of wooden structures, should be enabled to gain access for repairs and maintenance to their structures, and to maintain access to services/utilities and boundary fences. It references standard HRZ - S3 and states that "amend if necessary", 1.5m front yard setback and a 1 metre yard are considered absolute minimums (perhaps should be more).	Seeks that there are adequate setbacks for buildings and structures from neighbouring boundaries in any residential zone. 1.5m front yard setback and a 1 metre yard are considered absolute minimums (perhaps should be more).	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.188	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Support in part	Supports HRZ-S3 to the extent it is consistent with the MDRS. However, it is considered that additional exclusions should be integrated with the standard to reflect that some developments may occur adjacent to less sensitive zones.	Retain HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.189	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Supports HRZ-S3 to the extent it is consistent with the MDRS. However, it is considered that additional exclusions should be integrated with the standard to reflect that some developments may occur adjacent to less sensitive zones.	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) so that it does not apply to boundaries adjoining open space and recreation zones, commercial and mixed use zones, and special purpose zones.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.388	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Support	HRZ-S3 is supported as it will help enable facilities and services well suited to a residential setting.	Retain HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.476	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Support in part	Supports HRZ-S3 in general subject to amendments being made to reflect the relevant height control as sought for other standards and to achieve improved regional alignment and enable appropriate levels of intensification in the HRZ.	Retain HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.477	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Supports HRZ-S3 in general subject to amendments being made to reflect the relevant height control as sought for other standards and to achieve improved regional alignment and enable appropriate levels of intensification in the HRZ.	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: 1. For any site where HRZ-S1 applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4-19 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries within 21.5 m from the frontage, as shown in Diagram 6 below. [diagram] 2. For any site where HRZ-S2 applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 8 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries except where (1) above is applicable, and except where (3) or (4) below is applicable; 3. For any site where HRZ-S2 applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 56 metres vertically above ground level along any boundary that adjoins a site in: ...	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.35	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZS3	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Accept	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.85	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend		Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: 1. For any site where HRZ-S1 applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries, as shown in Diagram 6 below; [Diagram] ... [Also delete diagram]	Reject	No
Anna Kemble Welch	434.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S3 should be amended to allow for more daily sunlight access throughout the year. Carrara Park in Newtown is in the middle of a residential area and close to a large amount of WCC housing with many families who use the park as their playground and social space to meet friends. If neighbouring properties are designated as Medium or High Density residential, then future development could easily overshadow the open space and make the playground cold and damp, uninviting and unhealthy. The provision in item 4 does not go far enough to protect this from happening. Retaining a minimum of 70% sunlight for only half the year (spring to autumn equinox) for only the hours of 10am to 3pm means the park could be heavily shaded for the other half of the year, autumn to spring, which is the time people really need the sunshine. 10am to 3pm cuts out the times children are likely to play in the park after school, so by the time they get there it is no longer sunny.	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: ... 4. For any site where HRZ-S2 or HRZ-S1 applies that is located within 60 meters of adjacent to a site in the Natural Open Space Zone, Open Space Zone, or Sport and Active Recreation Zone: all buildings and structures must be designed and located to maintain sunlight access to a minimum of 70% of the open space site area during 10am to 4.30pm throughout the year. 3pm at either of the equinoxes (i.e. 21 March or 23 September) - ...	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.9	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Oppose	Inconsistent with the MDRS and with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow	Reject	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.9	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Oppose	Inconsistent with the MDRS and with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow	Reject	No
Kirsty Woods	437.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that the current standards for High Density Residential fail to address effects adequately, including loss of sunlight. Heights from which recession planes on the southern boundary of a new development are measured should also be adjusted down to minimise loss of sun from the north of neighbouring properties.	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: 1. For any site where HRZ-S1 applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries, as shown in Diagram 6 below its northern boundary, and 2 metres vertical above ground level on its southern, eastern and western boundaries; 2. For any site where HRZ-S2 applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 8 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries, its northern boundary except where (3) or (4) below is applicable, and 5 metres vertically above ground level on its southern, eastern and western boundaries; ...	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Newtown Residents' Association	440.26	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that HRZ-S3 should be amended, as it is too limited and does not provide enough protection from shade.</p> <p>It is considered that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A 4m wall on the north boundary, with a 60 degree recession plane, would allow a complete blocking of sun for existing homes on Newtown's small sections, where there is likely to only be a small side yard. - The standard only applies to buildings in the HRZ directly adjacent to a park, and not to buildings across the street or otherwise separated from the park boundary. - The days and hours this standard applies are too restrictive and will often be reached with only minor changes to the maximum permitted height. However it is during the winter that the need for sunlight is most acute, and a building that meets the standard at the solstice will be shading a much bigger area by mid winter. Carrara Park in Newtown is an example of a space that will be affected by this standard. - Peak usage for primary and secondary school aged children is after school, so 3pm is too early for them; the time should extend to at least 4pm and preferably 4.30pm. - Sites where HRZ-S1 applies have a required set back from the boundary, but if someone chooses to build to the allowed 11m height then the remaining bulk of the building still casts a significant shadow. <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>4. For any site where HRZ-S2 or HRZ-S1 applies that is located adjacent to within 60m of a site in the Natural Open Space Zone, Open Space Zone, or Sport and Active Recreation Zone: all buildings and structures must be designed and located to maintain sunlight access to a minimum of 70% of the open space site area during 10am to 3pm 4pm at either of the equinoxes (i.e. 21 March or 23 September) and at midwinter ie. 23 June.</p>	Reject	No
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Oppose	Considers HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as very limited and simply not adequate.	Not specified.	Reject	No
Catharine Underwood	481.24	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that the standard is very limited and simply not adequate, given the buildings in the new medium density zone can go right to site boundaries.	Amend HRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) to be stricter.	Reject	No
AdamsonShaw	137.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	<p>Considers that HRZ-S4 should be amended as the current standards in the Operative District Plan for the corresponding zone are more permissive than the PDP yard/setback standards.</p> <p>The front yard setback should be 1 metre as it is in the ODP for the inner residential zone.</p>	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) so that the front yard setback is 1 metre.	Reject	No
AdamsonShaw	137.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S4 should be amended as the current standards in the Operative District Plan for the corresponding zone are more permissive than the PDP yard/setback standards.	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) so that there is no side or rear yard setback requirement except that, a minimum width of 1 metre must be maintained between buildings where a residential building (other than an accessory building) on an adjoining site is sited less than 1 metre from the boundary.	Reject	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.89	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	<p>Rejects the deletion of yard setback standards. For sites adjoining the rail corridor, setbacks ensure that people can use and maintain their land and buildings safely without needing to extend out into the railway corridor, minimising the risks of physical interference on railway operations and health and safety hazards on these residents.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Zaffa Christian	174.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	<p>Considers that a one metre needs to be maintained in order to minimise damage in an earthquake. This is based on recommendations made by Michael Fowler.</p> <p>Building this close with high-medium rise buildings, also contravenes the sunshine clause currently being upheld by the environmental commission.</p>	<p>Seeks that MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) applies to developments of 1 - 3 units, so that buildings are setback at least one metre from the fence/boundary line.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Accept in part	Yes
Jon Gaupset	175.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	<p>Considers that a one metre needs to be maintained in order to minimise damage in an earthquake. This is based on recommendations made by Michael Fowler.</p> <p>Building this close with high-medium rise buildings, also contravenes the sunshine clause currently being upheld by the environmental commission.</p>	<p>Seeks that MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) applies to developments of 1 - 3 units, so that buildings are setback at least one metre from the fence/boundary line.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Accept in part	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Avryl Bramley	202.42	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that this has been the case in the past and has been a recipe for disaster leaving individual homeowners trying to wrench enforcement compliance out of builders who think they have a right to trespass on adjoining properties and or demolish structures they do not own.	Seeks that HRZ-S4 is amended to require boundary setbacks. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	Yes
Avryl Bramley	202.43	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that this has been the case in the past and has been a recipe for disaster leaving individual homeowners trying to wrench enforcement compliance out of builders who think they have a right to trespass on adjoining properties and or demolish structures they do not own.	Seeks reinstatement of side yards in residential areas. [Inferred reinstatement of front and side yards for 1-3 units in HRZ-S4].	Accept in part	Yes
Russell Taylor	224.4	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that multi unit developments need to be encouraged	Seeks that HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) not apply to multi unit developments.	Accept in part	No
Victoria Stace	235.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that yard setbacks enable adjacent property owners of wooden structures gain access for repairs and maintenance to their structures.	Seeks that HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) is amended to require 1.5m front yard setback and 1m side yard setback for all properties in the zone, including sites with 1 - 3 dwellings.	Accept in part	Yes
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	237.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that this enables adjacent property owners of wooden structures gain access for repairs and maintenance to their structures. [Note the submitter refers to HRZ-S3, which is the height in relation to boundary standard]	Seeks that HRZ-S4 is amended to require 1.5m front yard setback and 1m side yard setback for all properties in the zone, including sites with 1 - 3 dwellings. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	Yes
Paul Ridley-Smith	245.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Support in part	Supports the minimum yard setbacks of 1.5m (front yard) and 1m (side yards) in all residential zones. Considers that this enables adjacent property owners of wooden structures gain access for repairs and maintenance to their structures.	Supports HRZ-S4 (Building setbacks) with amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Paul Ridley-Smith	245.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that the minimum yard setbacks of 1.5m (front yard) and 1m (side yards) should apply in all residential zones as this enables adjacent property owners of wooden structures gain access for repairs and maintenance to their structures.	Seeks that HRZ-S4 is amended to require 1.5m front yard setback and 1m side yard setback for all properties in the zone, including sites with 1 - 3 dwellings. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.148	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) exemptions as follows: This standard does not apply to: <u>a. Developments of 1-3 household units with respect to the front and side yard set-back requirements;</u> <u>and</u> <u>b. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; and</u> <u>c. Fences or standalone walls;</u> <u>d. Uncovered decks and uncovered structures no more than 500mm in height above ground level;</u> <u>e. Eaves up to 600mm in width;</u> <u>and</u> <u>f. Multi-unit housing; and</u> <u>g. Retirement villages.</u>	Accept in part	Yes
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.90	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	Rejects exempting 1-3 dwellings from complying with yard setback standards. For sites adjoining the rail corridor, setbacks ensure that people can use and maintain their land and buildings safely without needing to extend out into the railway corridor, minimising the risks of physical interference on railway operations and health and safety hazards on these residents. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow	Reject	No
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.27	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S4 should be amended to have an exception for low decks and eaves. Both the front & side yard requirements are more restrictive than current rules. There are also no exceptions for low decks or eaves. A wall 1m clear of the boundary with an eave up to 600 wide above is consistent with other regulatory requirements, so keeping the side yard requirement but allowing a 600 eave (as at GRUZ-S4) would be reasonable, as would that provision's allowance for low decks.	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: a. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; and b. Fences or standalone walls; and c. <u>Uncovered decks no more than 500mm in height above ground level; and</u> d. <u>Eaves up to 600mm in width</u>	Accept in part	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Khoi Phan	326.39	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows: Yard Minimum depth Front 1.5 metres 1.0 metre Side 1 metre 0.5 metre Rear 1 metre 0.5 metre (excluded on corner sites) 	Reject	No
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that setback requirements should be modelled after the Sydney Design Guide, by taking into account the width of the street (i.e. narrower the street, lower the height in which a setback takes effect) and the height of the building (i.e. higher the building, the greater the setback is).	Seeks that setback requirements take into account the width of the streets and heights of buildings.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from HRZ-S4.	Retain HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.368	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Support in part	Standard HRZ-S4 is supported, but amendment is sought	Retain Standard HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) with amendment.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.369	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S4 should have immediate legal effect to align with the MDRS requirements, and to avoid confusion where boundary setbacks are applied from both the operative and proposed district plan. It is noted the intention of the NPS-UD is to enable urban environments to evolve and change, enabled by the national standards.	Seeks to amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to ensure it has immediate legal effect.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.389	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that the boundary setbacks do not provide for efficient use of land, and will continue to perpetuate the poor land use practice of infill without regard to long term liveability. The submitter seeks that the requirement for a frontage setback be removed, along with side yard requirements. The submitter seeks a greater rear yard set back. Considers that this will help get our medium and high density zones on a track towards a better, more efficient yet useable urban form for the years to come.	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to remove: - the minimum depth front yard requirement, - the side yard requirement for the first 20 m from front (street frontage) to back, and increase the rear yard requirement to 8 metres.	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.478	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Support in part	Supports HRZ-S4 subject to removal of reference to Multi-Unit housing.	Retain HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.479	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Supports HRZ-S4 subject to removal of reference to Multi-Unit housing.	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... c. Multi-unit housing where there are more than six residential units; and	Reject	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.123	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor. The Proposed Plan enables a 1m setback from side and rear boundaries shared with the rail corridor under HRZ-S4, increasing the risk that poles, ladders, or even ropes for abseiling equipment, could protrude into the rail corridor and increasing the risk of collision with a train or electrified overhead lines. KiwiRail consider that a 5m setback would be more appropriate in providing for vehicular access to the rear of buildings (e.g. a cherry picker) and allowing for scaffolding to be erected safely. An increased setback would provide for the unhindered operation of buildings, including higher rise structures and for the safer use of outdoor deck areas at height. This in turn fosters visual amenity, as lineside properties can be regularly maintained. KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures.	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows: 1. Buildings and structures must be set back from the relevant boundary by the minimum depth listed in the yards table below: Yard Boundary Minimum depth Front 1.5 metres Side 1 metre Rear 1 metre (excluded on corner sites) Rail corridor 5 metres	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	F589.36	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought insofar as it relates to the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners.	Disallow	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Donna Yule	421.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	Opposes having no residential minimum boundaries space of at least 1 metre. No consideration has been given to the geographical location of each individual suburb, its terrain and orientation to the sun. For suburbs that are built in a north south direction with hills either side and the main housing is on the flat, any 3 storey building will cast a significant shadow over many properties. Many more 3 storey development means a whole suburb except for those on the hills will be in permanent shadows. Added to that no space between properties, no outside areas to enjoy a little privacy. These suburbs will become sunless undesirable transitional suburbs where people will only stay a short time until they can afford to move elsewhere with sun & outdoor space.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Johnsonville Community Association	429.38	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that one major recent decision by the Council has been to remove the building front and side setback requirements in the current District Plan. Permitting buildings onto the boundary is a significant loss of neighbourhood amenity and is likely to further reduce the natural light next to high buildings.	Seeks that HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) is amended to require 1.5m front yard setback and 1m sideyard setback for all properties in the zone, including sites with 1 - 3 dwellings. [Inferred Decision Requested]	Accept in part	Yes
Kirsty Woods	437.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that the current standards for High Density Residential fail to address effects adequately, including loss of sunlight. Standards should acknowledge the effects on existing properties of new-builds, depending on whether they are built to the north, east, west or South.	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows: 1. Buildings and structures must be set back from the relevant boundary by the minimum depth listed in the yards table below: This standard does not apply to: a. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; <u>and</u> b. Fences or standalone walls; c. Multi-unit housing; and d. Retirement villages. The standard for Front Yard minimum depth do not apply to: <u>a. Multi-unit housing; and</u> <u>b. Retirement villages.</u>	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.169	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.169	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept	No
Meredith Robertshawe	444.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Seeks that front and side yard boundaries retained to increase the streetscape and visual amenity effects; and minimise potential dominance, lack of privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites.	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to reinstate the front and side yard set-backs for developments of 1 to 3 units.	Accept in part	Yes
Meredith Robertshawe	444.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Seeks that MRZ-S4 has front and side yard boundaries retained to retain existing streetscape and visual amenity effects; and minimise potential dominance, lack of privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites. Seeks the reinstatement of front and side yard boundaries for: a. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; b. Fences or standalone walls; c. Multi-unit housing; and d. Retirement villages Considers that this will ensure that space between separate buildings will be retained, and increase the amenity value for neighbourhoods where medium density building is allowed.	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: a. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; b. Fences or standalone walls; c. Multi-unit housing; and d. Retirement villages. ... [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend front setbacks to two metres as per the Operative District Plan.	Amend HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows: Buildings and structures must be set back from the relevant boundary by the minimum depth listed in the yards table below: Front - 1.5 metres 2 metres [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Catharine Underwood	481.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that the removal of front and side yard setbacks for medium density residential standards compliant development will negatively affect the street scape of suburban Wellington.	Seeks that front and side yard setbacks in HRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) apply to residential units that comply with the medium density residential standards.	Accept in part	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Catharine Underwood	481.25	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-54	Amend	Considers that all new buildings in the inner city should have a minimum set back of at least 1.5 (2m is better) to give room for a green corridor. Side yards are a good place for rubbish bins, compost bins or sheds to store bikes and other toys. A good example of why larger set backs are needed in The Paddington on Taranaki Street, which was meant to have several street trees lining the pavement and softening the development, as part of the consent but ended up with no trees due to underground services like pipes, telecommunications, electricity and sewerage. If there had been a setback, a green front would have been possible. The residents of The Paddington and Wellington are the poorer because of this.	Amend HRZ-54 (Boundary setbacks) to have setbacks of 2m and at least 1.5m in the inner city.	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.149	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-55	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Amend HRZ-55 (Building coverage) exemptions as follows: This standard does not apply to: <u>a. Uncovered decks and uncovered structures no more than 500mm in height above ground level;</u> <u>b. Eaves up to 600mm in width;</u> <u>c. a-Multi-unit housing; and</u> <u>d. b-Retirement villages.</u>	Accept	Yes
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.191	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-55	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from HRZ-55.	Retain HRZ-55 (Building coverage) as notified.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.370	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-55	Support	Standard HRZ-55 is supported as it aligns with the MDRS requirements.	Retain HRZ-55 (Building coverage) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.480	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-55	Support in part	Supports HRZ-55 subject to removal of reference to Multi-Unit housing.	Retain HRZ-55 (Building coverage) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.481	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-55	Amend	Supports HRZ-55 subject to removal of reference to Multi-Unit housing.	Amend HRZ-55 (Building coverage) as follows: This standard does not apply to: <u>a. Multi-unit housing where there are more than six residential units; and</u> ...	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.192	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-56	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from HRZ-56.	Retain HRZ-56 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) as notified.	Accept	Yes
Waka Kotahi	370.371	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-56	Support	Standard HRZ-56 is supported as it aligns with the MDRS requirements.	Retain HRZ-56 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) as notified.	Accept	Yes
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.23	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-56	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-56 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) with amendment.	Reject	No
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.24	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-56	Amend	Considers that bin storage should have a specific and acknowledged location on site that is outside an outdoor living space.	Amend HRZ-56 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) as follows: 1. A residential unit at ground floor level must have an outdoor living space that is at least 20 square metres and that comprises ground floor, balcony, patio, or roof terrace space that: a. Where located at ground level, has no dimension less than 3 metres; b. Where provided in the form of a balcony, patio, or roof terrace, is at least 8 square metres and has a minimum dimension of 1.8 metres; c. Is accessible from the residential unit; d. May be: i. grouped cumulatively by area in 1 communally accessible location; or ii. located directly adjacent to the unit; and e. Is free of buildings, parking spaces, and servicing (including waste facilities) and maneuvering areas.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.39	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-56	Support	HRZ-56 is supported as provision for outdoor living space is an important part of ensuring a healthy and pleasant environment for people living in higher density areas.	Retain HRZ-56 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) as notified.	Accept	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.482	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-56	Oppose in part	Acknowledges that HRZ-56 is directly taken from the MDRS, however, considers that the standard could be made more enabling. HRZ-S13 for multi-unit housing is a more enabling outdoor living space requirement which is considered appropriate for all residential units as it provides sufficient onsite space and amenity. Amendments are sought to replace HRZ-56 with HRZ-S13 and delete reference to multi-unit housing and retirement villages.	Delete HRZ-56 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) in its entirety as notified. Seeks to replace standard with amendments sought to HRZ-S13.	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.144	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-56	Not specified	The RVA would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by The RVA within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.	Reject	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.144	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-56	Not specified	Ryman would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by Ryman within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.483	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-56	Amend	Acknowledges that HRZ-56 is directly taken from the MDRS, however, considers that the standard could be made more enabling. HRZ-S13 for multi-unit housing is a more enabling outdoor living space requirement which is considered appropriate for all residential units as it provides sufficient onsite space and amenity. Amendments are sought to replace HRZ-56 with HRZ-S13 and delete reference to multi-unit housing and retirement villages.	Delete HRZ-56 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) in its entirety as notified. Seeks to replace standard with amendments sought to HRZ-S13.	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.145	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-56	Not specified	The RVA would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by The RVA within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.	Reject	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.145	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-56	Not specified	Ryman would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by Ryman within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.193	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-57	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from HRZ-57.	Retain HRZ-57 (Outlook space (per unit)) as notified.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.372	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-57	Support	Standard HRZ-57 is supported as it aligns with the MDRS requirements.	Retain HRZ-57 (Outlook space (per unit)) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.391	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-57	Support	HRZ-57 is supported as provision for outdoor living space is an important part of ensuring a healthy and pleasant environment for people living in higher density areas.	Retain HRZ-57 (Outlook space (per unit)) as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.484	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-57	Oppose in part	Acknowledges that HRZ-57 is directly taken from the MDRS, however, considers that the standard could be made more enabling. HRZ-S14 for multi-unit housing is a more enabling provision which provides sufficient outlook space and is considered to be appropriate for all residential units regardless of the number on a site. Amendments are sought to replace MRZ-57 with MRZ-S14 and delete reference to multi-unit housing and retirement villages.	Delete HRZ-57 (Outlook space (per unit)) in its entirety as notified. Seeks to replace standard with amendments sought to HRZ-S14.	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.148	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-57	Not specified	The RVA would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by The RVA within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.	Reject	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.148	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-57	Not specified	Ryman would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by Ryman within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.485	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-57	Amend	Acknowledges that HRZ-57 is directly taken from the MDRS, however, considers that the standard could be made more enabling. HRZ-S14 for multi-unit housing is a more enabling provision which provides sufficient outlook space and is considered to be appropriate for all residential units regardless of the number on a site. Amendments are sought to replace MRZ-57 with MRZ-S14 and delete reference to multi-unit housing and retirement villages.	Delete HRZ-57 (Outlook space (per unit)) in its entirety as notified. Seeks to replace standard with amendments sought to HRZ-S14.	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.149	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-57	Not specified	The RVA would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by The RVA within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.	Reject	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.149	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-57	Not specified	Ryman would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by Ryman within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Craig Palmer	492.30	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S7	Oppose	Considers that HRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) avoids specifying access to direct sunlight within principal living rooms. The very small living spaces allowed for under HRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing), i.e. 35m2 to 55m2, necessitate a counterbalancing measure to ensure that direct sunlight prevents claustrophobia and depression from living in confined shaded spaces. In Wellington direct sunlight enjoyed indoors is crucially important. [Refer to original submission for full detail].	Seeks that provision is made to ensure that principal living rooms enjoy a minimum of two hours of direct sunlight from June to August.	Reject	No
Craig Palmer	492.31	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S7	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) avoids specifying access to direct sunlight within principal living rooms. The very small living spaces allowed for under HRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing), i.e. 35m2 to 55m2, necessitate a counterbalancing measure to ensure that direct sunlight prevents claustrophobia and depression from living in confined shaded spaces. In Wellington direct sunlight enjoyed indoors is crucially important. [Refer to original submission for full detail].	Seeks that provision is made to ensure that principal living rooms enjoy a minimum of two hours of direct sunlight from June to August.	Reject	No
Interprofessional Trust	96.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S8	Amend	Considers that the 20% glazing standard has no support in science and that glass is not an insulating cladding. [Refer to original submission for further details]	Seeks that the 20% glazing standard is amended to say 15-50% glass when oriented 90° of north and 20% max for other orientations, excluding shopfronts [refer to submission for further details].	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.194	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S8	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from HRZ-S8.	Retain HRZ-S8 (Windows to street) as notified.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.373	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S8	Support	Standard HRZ-S8 is supported as it aligns with the MDRS requirements.	Retain HRZ-S8 (Windows to street) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.392	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S8	Support	HRZ-S8 is supported as the standard will help ensure attractiveness at street level, as well as provide for passive surveillance: designing for safety is highly important in built environments.	Retain HRZ-S8 (Windows to street) as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.486	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S8	Support in part	Supports HRZ-S8 subject to removal of reference to Multi-Unit housing.	Retain HRZ-S8 (Windows to street) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.487	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S8	Amend	Supports HRZ-S8 subject to removal of reference to Multi-Unit housing.	Amend HRZ-S8 (Windows to street) as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: i. <u>Multi-unit housing where there are more than six residential units</u> ; and ...	Reject	No
Phillippa O'Connor	289.37	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S9	Not specified	Considers that 'landscaped area' could benefit from a definition.	Seeks clarity on the interpretation of 'landscaped area' as it relates to standard HRZ-S9 (Landscaped area).	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.195	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S9	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from HRZ-S9.	Retain HRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) as notified.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.374	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S9	Support	Standard HRZ-S9 is supported as it aligns with the MDRS requirements.	Retain HRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.393	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S9	Support	HRZ-S9 is supported as the standard will ensure that increased density is done well, with benefits for health and wellbeing through fostering a biophilic environment.	Retain HRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.488	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S9	Support in part	Supports HRZ-S9 subject to removal of reference to Multi-Unit housing.	Retain HRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.150	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S10	Oppose in part	Considers that given this is not a building provision, but a three waters/infrastructure provision, it is more logical to locate this standard in the THW chapter. Note: HRZ-P9 and HRZ-S10 are to be relocated to THW – see new THW-P6 and THW-R7.	Delete HRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) in its entirety. Consequential renumbering of standards HRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) and HRZ-S17 (Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) to reflect change in numbering. Consequential update to references in notification clauses as required.	Accept	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.8	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S10	Support	Greater Wellington agree that the MRZ and HRZ policy and permeable surface rules are better suited to the Three Waters Chapter and support the amendments.	Allow	Accept	No
Phyllippa O'Connor	289.38	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S10	Not specified	Considers that the definitions lead to unnecessary restriction on site layout and design as currently drafted.	Seeks clarity on the whether the permeable surface area standard HRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) is inclusive of landscaped area.	Addressed in Report 5C	
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.196	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S10	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from HRZ-S10.	Retain HRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) as notified.	Addressed in Report 5C	
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.394	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S10	Support	HRZ-S10 is supported as the standard will ensure that increased density manages risks of stormwater runoff including risks to water quality and flooding.	Retain HRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) as notified.	Addressed in Report 5C	
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.489	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S10	Amend	Supports HRZ-S10 subject to removal of reference to Multi-Unit housing.	Amend HRZ-S10 (Landscaped area) and seeks amendment as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: a. Multi-unit housing where there are more than six residential units ; and ...	Addressed in Report 5C	
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.490	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S10	Support in part	Supports HRZ-S10 subject to removal of reference to Multi-Unit housing.	Retain HRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: a. Multi-unit housing where there are more than six residential units ; and ...	Addressed in Report 5C	
Design Network Architecture Limited	259.4	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S11	Amend	Considers that the current wording of HRZ-S11 potentially allows fences for multi-unit developments to be at any height provided the fences were not immediately on the front boundary.	Seeks amendment to HRZ-S11 (Fences and Standalone Walls) to improve clarity to avoid fences for multi-unit developments being able to have any height as long as they are not on the front boundary.	Accept	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.209	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S11	Support in part	Considers it important that the erection of fences and walls will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Fences and walls should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ	Support HRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls), with amendment.	Accept	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.210	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S11	Amend	Considers it important that the erection of fences and walls will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Fences and walls should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ	Amend HRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) as follows: 1. Any fence or standalone wall, or combination of these structures, must not exceed : a. Exceed a maximum height of 2m above ground level where within 1m of any side or rear boundary. b. Obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities. 2. On a front boundary or in a front boundary setback any fence or standalone wall, or combination of these structures, must not exceed : a. Exceed a maximum height of 2m above ground level; and b. Any part of a fence or standalone wall above 1.2m in height must be 50% visually transparent for its entire length, as shown in Diagram 8 below. c. Obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities.	Accept	Yes
Khoi Phan	326.40	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S11	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend HRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) as follows: 1. Any fence or standalone wall, or combination of these structures, must not exceed: a. A maximum height of 2m <u>1.5m</u> above ground level where within 1m of any side or rear boundary;	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.197	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S11	Support in part	Supports the 2m height standard for fences/walls but considers an exclusion is required for temporary fences/walls e.g. for noise mitigation during construction.	Retain HRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.198	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S11	Amend	Supports the 2m height standard for fences/walls but considers an exclusion is required for temporary fences/walls e.g. for noise mitigation during construction.	Amend HRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) to exclude temporary fences/walls from the standard.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.395	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S11	Amend	Considers that solid fences of 2m height destroy streetscapes, detract from neighbourhood interactions, and create unsafe environments. The submitter seeks that fences should not be allowed to be more than 1.2m in height where that fence fronts the street, and that the provision for 2 m with the area above 1.2m being 50% visually transparent be applied to fences abutting public walkways.	Amend HRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) as follows: - Require a fence on a front boundary to be no more than 1.2m in height. - Require a fence abutting a public walkway to be no more than 2 m with the area above 1.2m being 50% visually transparent.	Accept in part	Yes
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.57	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S11	Oppose	Concerned that the height of fences at which they are allowed as permitted activities should be lowered. High fences that cannot be seen through, are a public space problem for safety reasons.	Seeks amendment to standard HRZ-S11 (Fences and Standalone walls).	Accept in part	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.58	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S11	Amend	Concerned that the height of fences at which they are allowed as permitted activities should be lowered. High fences that cannot be seen through, are a public space problem for safety reasons.	Seeks that MRZ-S11 is amended so that the fences up to 1m can be built with any material along a boundary with public space, and where higher than 1 metre they must be of a material that allows pedestrians to see through it from the adjacent path.	Accept in part	Yes
Property Council New Zealand	338.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S12	Amend	Considers that minimum unit sizes, coupled with increased height density, run the risk of buildings that are smaller in floor space but greater in height. The overall design outcome should be considered so that adverse design outcomes for small, skinny buildings with less total floor space be avoided.	Seeks that overall design outcomes be considered when setting minimum unit sizes in HRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing).	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.491	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S12	Support in part	Supports HRZ-S12 in part, but considers that there should be smaller floor areas for studio units and for simplicity, a minimum floor area for 1 or bedrooms.	Retain HRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.492	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S12	Amend	Supports HRZ-S12 in part, but considers that there should be smaller floor areas for studio units and for simplicity, a minimum floor area for 1 or bedrooms.	Amend HRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing) as follows: 1. Residential units, including any dual key unit, must meet the following minimum sizes: Residential Unit Type Minimum Net Floor Area a. Studio Unit 35m² 30m ² b. 1 or more bedroom(s) unit 40m ² c. 2+ bedroom unit 55m²	Reject	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.86	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S12	Oppose	Opposes HRZ-S12 as the submitter considers: - Minimum residential unit sizes restrict the ability of developers to provide affordable housing choices and a diverse range of housing. - Occupiers are well-equipped to make their own decisions as to the type and size of dwelling. - Health, fire egress and overcrowding issues that arise from small sized dwellings are best dealt with by other legislation (e.g. Building Act 2004, Housing Improvement Regulations 1947, Residential Tenancies Act 1986). - Minimum unit sizes do not reflect the policy in HRZ-P2 to provide a range of housing sizes.	Delete HRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing) in its entirety.	Reject	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.87	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S12	Amend	Opposes HRZ-S12 as the submitter considers: - Minimum residential unit sizes restrict the ability of developers to provide affordable housing choices and a diverse range of housing. - Occupiers are well-equipped to make their own decisions as to the type and size of dwelling. - Health, fire egress and overcrowding issues that arise from small sized dwellings are best dealt with by other legislation (e.g. Building Act 2004, Housing Improvement Regulations 1947, Residential Tenancies Act 1986). - Minimum unit sizes do not reflect the policy in HRZ-P2 to provide a range of housing sizes.	Seeks that if Council does decide to retain minimum residential unit sizes, it should be clearly defined that hotel accommodation, student accommodation and other similar accommodation types are distinct from residential unit sizes. The definition of residential units does not clearly exclude student accommodation and may render it subject to these minimum sizes.	Reject	No
Craig Palmer	492.32	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S12	Oppose	Considers that the minimum unit size standards in HRZ-S12 are small.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Design Network Architecture Limited	259.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Clarify HRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) "Minimum Dimension" - so that for communal shared living spaces an 8m dimension is required at only one portion of the outdoor living space, with the other dimension able to be smaller than this. i.e. not an 8m x 8m space.	Accept in part	Yes
Design Network Architecture Limited	259.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Seeks amendment to HRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) to allow 10m ² minimum area to be achieved with alternative dimensions of 5m x 2m, or 3.2m x 3.2m.	Reject	No
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.28	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Amend	Considers that the outdoor living space for multi-unit housing in HRZ-S13 has large requirements. The requirement for only 10 square metres of communal outdoor living space per every 5 units fits oddly with both the much larger requirement per unit if the space is private and also the 8m minimum dimension requirement. An 8m x 8m area, would in theory be sufficient communal space for 30 residential units with 4 square metres 'spare' increasing the allowance 5 square metres (matching the studio/1 bedroom private allowance) would leave the minimum area as adequate for 12 residential units. There are also sites within this zone where the site width is less than 8m.	Amend HRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) as follows: Living Space Type ... b. Communal i. For every 5 units unit Minimum area - 10m² 5m ² Minimum dimension - 8m <u>except where site width is less than 8m. In that situation an area the full width of the site and 8m deep is acceptable.</u>	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.493	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Oppose	Considers that HRZ-S13 is appropriate to apply to all sites. Seeks that this standard replace HRZ-S6 as the level of outdoor living area proposed by this standard is appropriate for all sites not just sites developed with more than 3 residential units.	Opposes HRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) and seeks that HRZ-S13 replace the standard with the following amendment to the title of HRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) as follows: Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.146	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Not specified	The RVA would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by The RVA within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.	Reject	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.146	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Not specified	Ryman would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by Ryman within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.494	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S13 is appropriate to apply to all sites. Seeks that this standard replace HRZ-S6 as the level of outdoor living area proposed by this standard is appropriate for all sites not just sites developed with more than 3 residential units.	Opposes HRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) and seeks that HRZ-S13 replace the standard with the following amendment to the title of HRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) as follows: Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.147	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Not specified	The RVA would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by The RVA within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.	Reject	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.147	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Not specified	Ryman would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by Ryman within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.	Reject	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.88	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S13	Oppose	Opposes this provision for the following reasons: - mandating unutilised external areas is expensive and will have a detrimental impact on dwelling prices. -there is insufficient economic justification for the provision and it does not meet the section 32, Resource Management Act 1991 tests for appropriateness. -there is also a lack of sufficient research that underpins Council's evidence base. -Wellington's climate also reduces the amenity and use of outdoor living spaces, which can be exposed and windy.	Delete HRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) in its entirety.	Reject	No
Judith Graykowski	80.10	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) is very limited and simply not adequate, given the buildings in the HRZ can go right to site boundaries.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Vivienne Morrell	155.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) is very limited and simply not adequate, given that HRZ buildings can go right to site boundaries.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Pauletta Wilson	257.6	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Amend	Considers that the plan has very limited controls to manage shading and sunshine and that these are not adequate given buildings in the new high density zone can go right to site boundaries.	Seeks that HRZ-S14 (outlook space for multi unit housing) is amended to limit the shading of private properties beyond the controls that are in the plan already.	Reject	No
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S14 is inadequate, given buildings can go right up to site boundaries. Design requirements for multi-unit residential developments need to be strengthened to future-proof buildings and provide for good community experience.	Amend HRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) to better future-proof buildings and provide for good community experience.	Reject	No
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.21	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S15 is inadequate, given buildings can go right up to site boundaries. Design requirements for multi-unit residential developments need to be strengthened to future-proof buildings and provide for good community experience.	Amend HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) to better future-proof buildings and provide for good community experience.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.495	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Oppose	Considers that HRZ-S14 is appropriate to apply to all sites. Seeks that this standard replace HRZ-S7 as the level of outdoor living area proposed by this standard is appropriate for all sites not just sites developed with more than 3 residential units.	Opposes HRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) and seeks that HRZ-S14 replace the standard with the following amendment to the title of HRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) as follows: Outlook space for multi-unit housing	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.150	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Not specified	The RVA would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by The RVA within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.	Reject	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.150	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Not specified	Ryman would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by Ryman within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.496	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S14 is appropriate to apply to all sites. Seeks that this standard replace HRZ-S7 as the level of outdoor living area proposed by this standard is appropriate for all sites not just sites developed with more than 3 residential units.	Opposes HRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) and seeks that HRZ-S14 replace the standard with the following amendment to the title of HRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) as follows: Outlook space for multi-unit housing	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.151	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Not specified	The RVA would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by The RVA within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.	Reject	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.151	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Not specified	Ryman would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by Ryman within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.	Reject	No
Il Casino Apartment Body Corporate	426.1	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Oppose	Considers that the standard requires a more context-specific standard to define what constitutes acceptable levels of natural light. For example, lower level apartments may lose daylight due to high neighbouring buildings, resulting in colder, darker apartments that use more electricity and do not result in a desirable urban living environment.	Opposes HRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Il Casino Apartment Body Corporate	426.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Amend	Considers that the standard requires a more context-specific standard to define what constitutes acceptable levels of natural light. For example, lower level apartments may lose daylight due to high neighbouring buildings, resulting in colder, darker apartments that use more electricity and do not result in a desirable urban living environment.	Amend HRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) to have better design considerations and with specific consideration given to natural light for high rises.	Reject	No
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Oppose	Considers HRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) very limited and simply not adequate.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Catharine Underwood	481.26	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S14	Amend	Considers that the standard is very limited and simply not adequate, given the buildings in the new medium density zone can go right to site boundaries.	Amend HRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) to be stricter.	Reject	No
Judith Graykowski	80.11	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) is very limited and simply not adequate, given the buildings in the HRZ can go right to site boundaries.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Vivienne Morrell	155.14	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) is very limited and simply not adequate, given that HRZ buildings can go right to site boundaries.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Pauletta Wilson	257.7	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Amend	Considers that the plan has very limited controls to manage shading and sunshine and that these are not adequate given buildings in the new high density zone can go right to site boundaries.	Seeks that HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) is amended to limit the shading of private properties beyond the controls that are in the plan already.	Reject	No
Steve Dunn	288.8	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Amend	Considers that two metre setbacks from boundaries and restricted rootzones in pavement does not support healthy trees or the objectives of a vibrant green living environment. A larger growing zone and porous ground is needed.	Seeks that HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) is amended to ensure healthy tree growth in streetscape and intensified residential areas.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.199	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Support	Does not oppose HRZ-S15 and the minimum privacy separation to a boundary above ground level at retirement villages.	Retain HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as notified.	Accept	No
Sarah Walker	367.2	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Oppose	Concerned about the minimum of 2 metres from the boundary that apartments can be built from existing apartments. Considers this will change the look and feel of the community, block light and pose a security risk. Also considers this will impact upon the value of homes which will place financial pressure on owners. Considers that in apartments with windows only on one side that sunlight would not be able to enter apartments with the new standards.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Waka Kotahi	370.375	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Not specified	Submitter takes a neutral position on HRZ-S15. Notes that there are no HIRB or boundary setback standards.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.497	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Support in part	Supports HRZ-S15. However, considers that reference to multi-unit housing should be deleted as this concept is not supported.	Retain HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.498	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Amend	Supports HRZ-S15. However, considers that reference to multi-unit housing should be deleted as this concept is not supported.	Amend HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing more than six residential units or a retirement village	Reject	No
Il Casino Apartment Body Corporate	426.3	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Oppose	Considers that a 2m setback does not result in good urban design that encourages people to live in the city. Considers that sense of community is lost as people do not want to spend as much time at home. Considers that privacy and security of residents will also be affected.	Opposes HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.73	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.73	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Il Casino Apartment Body Corporate	426.4	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Amend	Considers that a 2m setback does not result in good urban design that encourages people to live in the city. Considers that sense of community is lost as people do not want to spend as much time at home. Considers that privacy and security of residents will also be affected.	Amend HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) to require better design considerations and wider gaps between high rise buildings.	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.74	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.74	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.13	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Oppose	Considers HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) very limited and simply not adequate.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Catharine Underwood	481.27	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S15	Amend	Considers that the standard is very limited and simply not adequate, given the buildings in the new medium density zone can go right to site boundaries.	Amend HRZ-S15 (Minimum privacy separation to a boundary for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) to be stricter.	Reject	No
James Coyle	307.18	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S16	Amend	Considers that the 20m building depth standard is too long for Newtown.	Seeks that HRZ-S16 (Building depth for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) is reduced for Newtown.	Reject	No
James Coyle	307.19	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S16	Amend	Considers that boundary setbacks for front yards should be provided to encourage planting and soil retention.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, with requirement to provide front yards for developments of 1 to 3 units.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.200	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S16	Oppose in part	Opposes the applicability of a maximum building depth standard for retirement villages. It is considered that the proposed matters of discretion for HRZ-R17 and HRZ-R14 are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Opposes HRZ-S16 (Maximum building depth for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and seeks amendment	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.201	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S16	Amend	Opposes the applicability of a maximum building depth standard for retirement villages. It is considered that the proposed matters of discretion for HRZ-R17 and HRZ-R14 are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Amend the title of HRZ-S16 (Maximum building depth for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: HRZ-S16 Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.376	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S16	Oppose	Considers HRZ-S16 should be removed as it is unnecessarily restrictive to development. Considers that residential developments are already required to consider residential [design guide] and require consent as a RD activity. Submitter is unsure of the intended purpose of restricting depth, and is concerned about the implications where large multi-unit residential developments are proposed. Considers that this standard and HRZ-S17 may be better addressed with a building coverage standard that enables densities sought by the NPS UD for urban areas.	Delete Standard HRZ-S16 (Maximum building depth for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) in its entirety as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.499	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S16	Oppose	Opposes HRZ-S16 as Building for multi-unit housing (more than six units) is a Restricted Discretionary activity so this matter can be considered as part of that consent process, so this standard is unnecessary.	Delete HRZ-S16 (Maximum building depth for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) in its entirety as notified.	Reject	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.89	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S16	Oppose	Considers that maximum building depth is too restrictive and they do not consider that it meets the section 32, Resource Management Act 1991 tests for appropriateness.	Delete HRZ-S16 (Maximum building depth for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) in its entirety.	Reject	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.90	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S16	Amend	Considers that maximum building depth is too restrictive and they do not consider that it meets the section 32, Resource Management Act 1991 tests for appropriateness.	Remove HRZ-S16 (Maximum building depth for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) from HRZ and include the provision in a non-statutory Design Guide.	Reject	No
James Coyle	307.20	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S17	Amend	Considers that the 10m building separation standard needs to exclude car parking and decks from these areas. These areas should be used for ecological or green spaces to ensure safe landing spots for birds, tree canopy and soil retention.	Seeks that HRZ-S17 (Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) excludes car parking and decks from within these areas.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.202	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S17	Oppose in part	Opposes the minimum building separation distance (being 10 m from any other building on the same site) for retirement villages as it would prevent linked buildings. It is considered that the proposed matters of discretion for HRZ-R17 and HRZ-R14 are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Opposes the title of HRZ-S17 (Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and seeks amendment	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.203	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S17	Amend	Opposes the minimum building separation distance (being 10 m from any other building on the same site) for retirement villages as it would prevent linked buildings. It is considered that the proposed matters of discretion for HRZ-R17 and HRZ-R14 are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Amend the title of HRZ-S17 (Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows: HRZ-S16 Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Waka Kotahi	370.377	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S17	Oppose	Considers that HRZ-S17 should be removed as it is unnecessarily restrictive to development. Considers that residential developments are already required to consider residential [design guide] and require consent as a RD activity. Submitter is concerned about the implications where large multi-unit residential developments are proposed.	Delete Standard HRZ-S17 (Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) in its entirety as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.500	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S17	Oppose	Opposes HRZ-S17 as Building for multi-unit housing (more than six units) is a Restricted Discretionary activity so this matter can be considered as part of that consent process, so this standard is unnecessary.	Delete HRZ-S17 (Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) in its entirety as notified.	Reject	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.91	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZ-S17	Oppose	Considers that the building separation distance is too restrictive and they do not consider it meets the RMA tests for appropriateness.	Delete HRZ-S17 (Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) in its entirety.	Reject	No
Aro Valley Community Council	87.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	The Aro Valley Community Council does not believe that the PDP understands or adequately responds to a number of important considerations (sunlight, aging infrastructure, character homes, wellbeing for community members particularly marginalised peoples). Considers HRZ zoning is inappropriate and some sites should retain character protection provided by the ODP. Considers that while intensification is important, it should not be at the expense of fundamentals such as biodiversity, sunlight and human scale.	Seeks site specific changes to zoning.	Accept in Part	Yes
Aro Valley Community Council	87.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that sunlight is scarce in Aro Valley and further losses of this will be unacceptable. Sunlight is a key component of health and wellbeing and it the Council's responsibility to protect and promote community wellbeing.	Seeks site specific changes to zoning.	Reject	No
Aro Valley Community Council	87.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that any increase in population density must be accompanied by, and increase, sunny and accessible open space.	Not specified.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.10	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the Residential Design Guide is not referenced in any rules for the High Density Residential Zone and greenfield development areas.	Seeks to ensure that the design guides are included in all necessary rules across chapters.	Reject	No
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.52	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Disallow	Accept	No
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.52	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Disallow	Accept	No
Ben Barrett	479.13	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Seeks that the highest intensity needs to happen in concentrated pockets, not allowed to be placed haphazardly across anywhere in Newtown. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that highest intensity developments needs to happen in concentrated pockets. [Inferred decision requested]	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.13	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that upzoning heights on swathes of housing is very 'destructive'. Considers high rise sites need to be carefully and individually selected according to topology with pockets of intensity if sites allow.	Allow	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Catharine Underwood	481.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that the PDP does not provide consistent natural and physical features and characteristics that contribute to a unique 'sense of place. Allowing large 22m buildings next to pepper potted heritage and character will create small, disconnected blocks easily compromised or destroyed by high density development adjacent.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Peter Preston	42.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that HRZ-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structures) does not adequately take account of areas where 21m high buildings with 5 metre boundaries are permitted up against Character Precincts, Heritage Areas, Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct or Character Precinct-extension areas proposed by Mt Victoria Historical Society. Afternoon sun may be blocked from these properties. Degradation and abandonment of these properties may ultimately occur as their heritage or character may be visually destroyed. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone of at least one property wide be required between any Character Precinct or heritage area border and a High Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.80	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that it is important for heritage buildings/areas not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent tall buildings. Considers that it is a settled legal principle that heritage buildings have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building while otherwise providing for appropriate development.	Allow	Reject	No
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Height Control Area 4 (area shaded blue on PDP figure on original submission) should be extended to include the McLean Flats site at 320A The Terrace. The site is now owned by the University and will be utilised for university purposes.	Amend the mapping to show the 21m height at 320A The Terrace.	Reject	No
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.9	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	HRZ-S2 height limit of 21m with regards to Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood. Considers that an 11m height limit will help preserve the unique character of the area. Lower Kelburn is not suitable for 21m height limit because of steep and narrow access, hilly and deeply indented physical character which would require significant infrastructural development to intensify. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the height limit in Lower Kelburn is set to 11m.	Accept in Part	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.272	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept in Part	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.167	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Accept in Part	Yes
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.17	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that Wesley Precinct and Lower Kelburn, the area between Bolton St to San Sebastian Rd or the cable car, and between the Botanic Gardens and the Motorway should be classified as a Character Precinct with demolition controls and height limit of 11m for the many reasons outlined the submission and others referred to in further submission, including that of Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood, submission 356.	Allow	Accept in Part	Yes
Priscilla Williams	293.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the hilly terrain makes this area unsuitable for high rise building.	Seeks that the Height Control in the area spanning Wesley Road, Aurora Terrace and Bolton Streets is amended to be no higher than 11m.	Accept in Part	Yes
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.18	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that Wesley Precinct and Lower Kelburn, the area between Bolton St to San Sebastian Rd or the cable car, and between the Botanic Gardens and the Motorway should be classified as a Character Precinct with demolition controls and height limit of 11m for the many reasons outlined the submission and others referred to in further submission, including that of Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood, submission 356.	Allow	Accept in Part	Yes
James Coyle	307.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Not specified	Considers that some areas are fine with maximum building heights of 21m due to topography. For example where the current Regent St Housing is tucked up against the hill.	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Hilary Watson	321.8	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Carrara Park should have 11m height control (Building Height Control 1) right round its boundary to get maximum possible sun all year round. Part of the properties around the park are currently inappropriately classified under Building Height Control 2 (21m).	Seeks that all development around Carrara Park is subject to a maximum height limit of 11 metres and this is shown in the mapping.	Reject	No
Khoi Phan	326.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the inner suburb of Mt Victoria, Mt Cook, Te Aro and Kelburn should be classified as High Density Residential Zones.	Make Mt Victoria, Mt Cook, Te Aro and Kelburn High Density Residential Zones.	Accept in Part	No
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.23	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Submitter 326 seeks to rezone Mount Victoria (and other suburbs) as High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow	Accept in Part	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.113	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers the submission point is more enabling of intensification than the NPS-UD and MDRS and is not justified.	Disallow	Accept in Part	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.193	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Disallow	Accept in Part	No
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.7	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	The 6-storey height limit at 35 to 61 Hankey Street is not supported, as these properties are along the ridgeline, steeply sloped, and already suffer from poor pedestrian and vehicle access.	Rezone 35 to 61 Hankey Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in Part	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.210	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept in Part	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.115	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Amend / Amend by rezone 35 to 65 Hankey Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept in Part	Yes
Investore Property Limited	405.7	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the provision of a broad area of six storey High Density Residential zoning in the wider Johnsonville catchment. Submitter considers that this gives effect to the NPS-UD and reflects the status of Johnsonville as a Metropolitan Centre.	Retain the High Density Residential Zone 21m building heights in the wider Johnsonville catchment as notified.	Accept in Part	No
Gregory Webber	33.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that Green Street is classified as a character precinct - requiring rezoning to MRZ	Rezone Green Street to Medium Density Residential Zone [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.214	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.108	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Gregory Webber	33.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes six storey buildings in Green Street and believes that two-three storey housing is acceptable.	Seeks that only two-three storey housing is permitted in Green Street.	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.215	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
Graham Mexted (No 2) Family Trust	66.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes HRZ zoning of 130 Main Road, Tawa. The building has been office space from the Tawa Borough Council use and rated commercially (rates & water) i.e. non-residential. It is currently used commercially as a cafe. At no time has the current owner used the building for residential use, as the Tawa Borough Council converted it into offices.	Rezone 130 Main Road, Tawa from High Density Residential Zone to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Addressed in Report 4C	
Aro Valley Community Council	87.7	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that 137 Abel Smith Street should be rezoned from HRZ to OSZ as this site forms part of Aro Park and there is a Mapping error.	Rezone 137 Abel Smith Street (Aro Park) from High Density Residential Zone to Open Space Zone.	Reject	No
Generation Zero	F554.11	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Oppose and further submit that: For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to jobs, shops, schools, community amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. The land is often the most resilient land in the city (being developed by colonists first). More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. Therefore, the development capacity (and its associated positive outcomes) lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Accept in part insofar as no reduction of enabled housing	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.236	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
Aro Valley Community Council	87.8	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the site at 39 Palmer Street should be rezoned from HRZ to MRZ in order to classify the site as Character Precinct.	Rezone 39 Palmer Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Generation Zero	F554.12	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Reject	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.237	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Aro Valley Community Council	87.9	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the site at 41 Palmer Street should be rezoned from HRZ to MRZ in order to classify the site as Character Precinct.	Rezone 41 Palmer Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	Yes
Generation Zero	F554.13	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Reject	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.238	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Aro Valley Community Council	87.10	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the site at 43 Palmer Street should be rezoned from HRZ to MRZ in order to classify the site as Character Precinct.	Rezone 43 Palmer Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Generation Zero	F554.14	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Reject	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.239	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Aro Valley Community Council	87.11	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the site at 45 Palmer Street should be rezoned from HRZ to MRZ in order to classify the site as Character Precinct.	Rezoning 45 Palmer Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	Yes
Generation Zero	F554.15	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Reject	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.240	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Aro Valley Community Council	87.12	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the site at 141 Abel Smith Street should be rezoned from HRZ to MRZ for protection of Heritage and avoiding casting shadows on Aro Park.	Rezoning 141 Abel Smith Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Generation Zero	F554.16	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Accept in part insofar as no reduction of enabled housing	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.241	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	F511.135	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Reject	No
Aro Valley Community Council	87.13	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the site at 143 Abel Smith Street should be rezoned from HRZ to MRZ for protection of Heritage and avoiding casting shadows on Aro Park.	Rezone 143 Abel Smith Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No
Generation Zero	F554.17	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Accept in part insofar as no reduction of enabled housing	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.242	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.136	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Reject	No
Aro Valley Community Council	87.14	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the site at 145 Abel Smith Street should be rezoned from HRZ to MRZ for protection of Heritage and avoiding casting shadows on Aro Park.	Rezone 145 Abel Smith Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No
Generation Zero	F554.18	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Accept in part insofar as no reduction of enabled housing	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.243	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.137	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Reject	No
Aro Valley Community Council	87.15	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the site at 147 Abel Smith Street should be rezoned from HRZ to MRZ for protection of Heritage and avoiding casting shadows on Aro Park.	Rezone 147 Abel Smith Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Generation Zero	F554.19	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Accept in part insofar as no reduction of enabled housing	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.244	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	F5111.138	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Reject	No
Aro Valley Community Council	87.18	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the sites on Boston Terrace should be zoned MRZ.	Rezoning Boston Terrace from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept	Yes
Generation Zero	F554.22	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Reject	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.247	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.140	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Aro Valley Community Council	87.19	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the sites to the north and east of 95A Aro Street should be zoned MRZ.	Rezone the properties to the north and east of 95A Aro Street as Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept in part	Yes
Generation Zero	F554.23	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Reject	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.248	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Aro Valley Community Council	87.20	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the sites to the north and east of 95A Aro Street should be zoned MRZ.	Rezone the properties at 72, 82 and 84 Aro Street as Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No
Generation Zero	F554.24	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Accept	No

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.249	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
Aro Valley Community Council	87.21	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that 24 Devon Street should be zoned MRZ to allow its classification as Character Precinct. Identified as both Primary and Contributory Character in Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review Prepared for Wellington City Council 23 January 2019 - their exclusion appears to be a mapping error.	Rezone 24 Devon Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept	Yes
Generation Zero	FS54.25	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskell report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Reject	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.250	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept	Yes
LIVE WELLington	FS96.94	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Aro Valley Community Council	87.22	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that 25 Devon Street should be zoned MRZ to allow its classification as Character Precinct. Identified as both Primary and Contributory Character in Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review Prepared for Wellington City Council 23 January 2019 - their exclusion appears to be a mapping error.	Rezone 25 Devon Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Generation Zero	F554.26	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Reject	Yes
Aro Valley Community Council	87.23	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that 26 Devon Street should be zoned MRZ to allow its classification as Character Precinct. Identified as both Primary and Contributory Character in Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review Prepared for Wellington City Council 23 January 2019 - their exclusion appears to be a mapping error.	Rezone 26 Devon Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept	Yes
Generation Zero	F554.27	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Reject	Yes
Aro Valley Community Council	87.24	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that 27 Devon Street should be zoned MRZ to allow its classification as Character Precinct. Identified as both Primary and Contributory Character in Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review Prepared for Wellington City Council 23 January 2019 - their exclusion appears to be a mapping error.	Rezone 27 Devon Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Generation Zero	F554.28	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Accept	Yes
Aro Valley Community Council	87.25	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that 28 Devon Street should be zoned MRZ to allow its classification as Character Precinct. Identified as both Primary and Contributory Character in Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review Prepared for Wellington City Council 23 January 2019 - their exclusion appears to be a mapping error.	Rezone 28 Devon Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept	Yes
Generation Zero	F554.29	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Reject	Yes
Aro Valley Community Council	87.26	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that 29 Devon Street should be zoned MRZ to allow its classification as Character Precinct. Identified as both Primary and Contributory Character in Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review Prepared for Wellington City Council 23 January 2019 - their exclusion appears to be a mapping error.	Rezone 29 Devon Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Generation Zero	F554.30	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskell report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Reject	Yes
Aro Valley Community Council	87.27	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that 30 Devon Street should be zoned MRZ to allow its classification as Character Precinct. Identified as both Primary and Contributory Character in Boffa Miskell Pre-1930 Character Area Review Prepared for Wellington City Council 23 January 2019 - their exclusion appears to be a mapping error.	Rezone 30 Devon Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept	Yes
Generation Zero	F554.31	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskell report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Reject	Yes
Aro Valley Community Council	87.28	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that all lots between 109 - 181 Aro Street should be rezoned from HRZ to MRZ. This is to allow their classification as Character Precinct. This area has been identified by Boffa Miskell " ... seven broad sub-areas within this area that exhibit a noticeably coherent concentration of pre-1930 properties with primary and contributory characteristics". These sub-areas included: " An area extending along the southern edge of Aro Street".	Rezone all lots between 109 and 181 Aro Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Generation Zero	FS54.32	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is "other" qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very 'character' of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as 'character' as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Reject	Yes
Tawa Business Group	107.11	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that 130 Main Road, Tawa should be rezoned to Neighbourhood Centre Zone. This site is currently used for commercial purposes by the Fusion Food Haus Grocery & Café. Rezoning to Neighbourhood Centre Zone would match the current lawful activity of the site and allow for future commercial activities to remain as a permitted activity thus increasing capacity for commercial development. NCZ permitted activity standards would arguably be more suitable to the existing and future land uses of these properties, particularly in terms of height and active frontage controls. Rezoning as HRZ would be consistent with the adjoining properties on the southern boundary of 130 Main Road and 157 Main Road. As a property situated at the edge of the HRZ and NCZ, rezoning as NCZ would maintain contiguous zoning. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Rezone 130 Main Road, Tawa from High Density Residential Zone to Neighbourhood Centre Zone.	Addressed in Report 4C	
Michael O'Rourke	194.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that HRZ four storey or 21m high buildings will effectively mitigate most of the liveability rules about outdoor space, glazing, boundaries, sun angle boundary heights and site coverage. Considers that we need to minimise the spread of individual high rise building pockets. [Inferred reason given].	Seeks that high rise buildings are concentrated in zones already high (the CBD and faded warehouse spine in lower Adelaide Road).	Reject	No
Kim McGuiness, Andrew Cameron, Simon Bachler, Deb Hendry, Penny Evans, Stephen Evens, David Wilcox, Mary Vaughan Roberts, Siva Naguleswaran, Mohammed Talim, Ben Sutherland, Atul Patel, Lewis Roney Yip, Sarah Collier Jaggard	204.6	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes the area between Adelaide Road, Stoke Street and Kenwyn Terrace being zoned as High Density Residential Zone and seeks that it is rezoned to Medium Density Residential Zone. Considers the impact of a 21m height limit on neighbouring properties. 21m height limit is inappropriate for the character of the surrounding area. Loss of solar access leads to damp homes and less energy efficient, loss of Biodiversity to the Newtown area, loss of wellbeing, and loss of Privacy. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Rezone the area between Adelaide Road, Stoke Street and Kenwyn Terrace from HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone).	Accept	Yes
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.10	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Not specified.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.228	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.114	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Pauletta Wilson	257.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes the Mt Cook Area being zoned as High Density Residential Zone and seeks that it is rezoned to Medium Density Residential Zone. Considers that the effect of new 6-storey blocks on surrounding neighbours in existing houses, making them shadier, damper, less healthy, and unpleasant to live in. The provisions such as recession planes, privacy, outlook space and solar access are not adequate because the buildings in the HRZ can go right to the boundary. Supports intensification in the Mt Cook area but wants it done effectively and without unnecessary destruction of the diversity of the community, its valuable assets and character,	Rezone the Mt Cook area from HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) with a height limit of 11m.	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.209	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Mary Sullivan	277.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes High Density Residential Zoning in the Prospect Terrace, Woodland Road, and the up-hill section of Frankmoore Avenue area. Considers that the area includes areas which are difficult to access on foot by most people, particularly elderly and people with young children or disabilities. Some of the area zoned as High density is up steep hills, with narrow roads, and have either no footpaths or footpaths on one side only. They are not therefore suitable for high density developments.	Rezone the area at Prospect Terrace, Woodland Road, and the up-hill section of Frankmoore Avenue from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept in part	Yes
Priscilla Williams	293.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the hilly terrain makes this area unsuitable for high rise building.	Rezone the area spanning Wesley Road, Aurora Terrace and Bolton Street from HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone).	Accept in part	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.173	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Roland Sapsford	305.20	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that 2, 4 and 6 Boston Terrace should not be zoned HRZ, as the six storey heights in this location would adversely affect a large number of existing infill dwellings on Boston Terrace, creating shade, dampness and privacy issues for many people.	Rezone 2 Boston Terrace, 4 Boston Terrace and 6 Boston Terrace from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.263	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept	Yes
LIVE WELLington	FS96.108	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.153	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Roland Sapsford	305.21	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that Palmer Street should not be surrounded on four sides by buildings with permitted heights of six storeys. Palmer Street is identified in the Proposed Plan as a "character precinct" with an 11m height limit for new buildings. Palmer Street already experiences significant shading from the existing high rise located between Palmer and Abel Smith Streets.	Seeks that all High Density Residential Zones adjoining Palmer Street be rezoned to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.264	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
LIVE WELLington	FS96.109	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	The Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.154	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lisa Nickson, Garrick Northover and Warren Sakey	313.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Amend the zoning of Aro Street from HRZ to MRZ.	Rezone Aro Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.159	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Inferred reference to submission 313.2]	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Penelope Borland	317.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports the rezoning of Mount Victoria from HRZ to MRZ. The balance between upzoning areas for increased density and retaining valuable character areas has not been struck appropriately by the Council and needs to be changed. More character areas can be retained without affecting the required housing needed.	Rezone Mount Victoria from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.182	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.130	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Penelope Borland	317.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports zone change from HRZ to MRZ at the top of Marjoribanks Street.	Rezone the top of Marjoribanks Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.183	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Penelope Borland	317.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports zone change from HRZ to MRZ on Hawker Street. Removing access to sunlight with 6 storey buildings in front of houses will result in poor mental and physical health outcomes, damp houses and overall negative impacts on wellbeing.	Rezone Hawker Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.184	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.126	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Penelope Borland	317.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports zone change from HRZ to MRZ for the entirety of Earls Terrace. The street has and will remain constrained by poor access and infrastructure and therefore should not be zoned for high density.	Rezone Earls Terrace from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.185	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.127	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Penelope Borland	317.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports zone change from HRZ to MRZ for the entirety of Port Street. The street has and will remain constrained by poor access and infrastructure and therefore should not be zoned for high density.	Rezone Port Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.186	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.128	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Reject	No
Penelope Borland	317.6	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports zone change from HRZ to MRZ for the entirety of Stafford Street. The street has and will remain constrained by poor access and infrastructure and therefore should not be zoned for high density.	Rezone Stafford Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.187	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.129	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Hilary Watson	321.9	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the upzoning of 73.2 percent of Newtown as HRZ is not respectful of the City's historic heritage and will result in the irrevocable loss of character, distinctiveness and identity across the suburb, including Character Precincts. The HRZ in the area will not effectively achieve the strategic direction supporting the creation of a liveable, well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing, as well as their health and safety. High Density zoning will also cause new housing to only be affordable to those with incomes above the median. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Reduce the extent of the High Density Residential Zone in Newtown and rezone as Medium Density Residential Zone in the mapping. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	Yes
Richard Murcott	322.10	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports zone change from HRZ to MRZ at the block bounded by Hobson St, Davis St, Moturoa St, Murphy St, Turnbull St, and Fitzherbert Tce in Thorndon.	Rezone the residential area bounded by Hobson St, Davis St, Moturoa St, Murphy St, Turnbull St, and Fitzherbert Tce in Thorndon from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept in part	Yes
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.45	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.287	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.178	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.]	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.19	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports the rezoning of Mount Victoria from HRZ to MRZ, aside from Kent Terrace.	Rezone Mount Victoria from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone, except Kent Terrace. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.192	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.98	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington.	Disallow	Accept in part	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.122	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports the rezoning of the Wesley Street area from HRZ to MRZ, with height limits of 11m for dwellings. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including appendix]	Rezone Wesley Road from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.270	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.165	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Josephine Brien / Tim Bollinger	365.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports the rezoning of all addresses adjacent to the open Community Centre grounds and the community recreational area on Aro Street from HRZ to MRZ. A High Density zoning is inappropriate for the requirements of this well-used inner city community area, that includes a basket ball court and a pedestrian cycle access way through the park to the top of Palmer street and into Wellington city. This is most likely an accident and should be corrected, as sunlight needs to reach the park.	Rezone all addresses adjacent to the open Community Centre grounds and the community recreational area on Palmer Street from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Residential Zone.	Accept in part	Yes
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the Earls Terrace and Port Street/Stafford Street area has qualities, including visibility which should qualify it as a character area. The submitter considers that Earls Terrace and Port Street/Stafford Street area has a particularly charming ambience and modification to the houses has generally been in keeping with the Mt Victoria architecture.	Amend zoning from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone for Earls Terrace, Port Street and Stafford Street.	Accept in part	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kirsty Woods	437.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes the High Density Residential zoning for suburban Newtown. High density zoning in this area fails to address effects adequately, including loss of sunlight, adverse effects associated with demolition and rebuilding and loss of green spaces. Considers that there is an excess of housing provided through the proposed district plan above what is required. By creating much larger areas to enable 6 storey buildings than is likely to be required, the council is promoting unnecessary adverse effects on existing housing. Considers that the alternative extent provided in the The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects submission is more appropriate.	Seeks that High Density Zoning in Newtown is limited / concentrated to the extent indicated in the Red Design Architects and Newtown Residents Association submissions. Seeks that all other areas are rezoned as Medium Density Residential.	Reject	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.61	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow	Reject	No
Kirsty Woods	437.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that if character precincts are not extended, high density zoned land in Newtown should be rezoned as Medium Density with an 11m height limit.	Rezone High Density Zone land in Newtown as Medium Density Zone.	Accept in part	Yes
Newtown Residents' Association	440.6	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that Newtown's residential streets outside the suburban centre should be classified as MRZ. In particular the zoning of several blocks around the Newtown suburban centre for heights of up to 21m seems unnecessary and counter productive to maintaining a well functioning urban environment. Allowing 6-storey development blocks in low-rise residential areas would have damaging effects on the value of neighbouring houses. Furthermore, combining terraced homes, typically of 3 storeys, with 6 storey apartment blocks doesn't give good results unless the sites are carefully planned. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Rezone Newtown's residential streets from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential zone.	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.207	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Kathryn Lethbridge	442.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes the High Density Residential Zoning of the Hobson Precinct (between Murphy Street and Hobson Street/Davis Street and the motorway) and considers that this should be rezoned as MRZ. Considers that MRZ for the Hobson Precinct meets the Government requirements for development and is more appropriate given the existing nature of the area and potential for inappropriate development.	Rezone the Hobson Precinct (between Murphy Street and Hobson Street/Davis Street and the motorway) from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept in part	Yes
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.70	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	WCC summary reads: The zone is a jewel in the Wellington character / heritage crown and appropriate houses in the area should be protected to prevent unnecessary loss to this key cultural asset for the city. Considers that MRZ for the Hobson Precinct meets the Government requirements for development and is more appropriate given the existing nature of the area and potential for inappropriate development.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.186	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Kay Larsen	447.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the make up of the area is already dense enough to be considered High-Density. Considers that the terrace is too small to accommodate further traffic from high density development. Considers that the infrastructure on The Terrace South is insufficient for further development. Considers that the hillside is steep and inappropriate for 6 storey development. Considers that there are many pathways, shortcuts, large old trees, housing and Boyd Wilson Sports Field scattered in the area.	Opposes High Density Residential Zoning in Southern Terrace (Area between Abel Smith Street, Ghuznee Street, Terrace and including St John Street and Abel Smith Street extension).	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.268	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.160	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Accept in part	Yes
Rachel Leilani	464.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the smaller 10 minute walkable catchment from the city centre from the draft District Plan would have no benefits and shift development to less well-suited areas.	Amend the high density zoning and around the city centre to cover at least the area within a 15 minute walkable catchment (rather than the current 10 minute catchment)	Accept in part	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.44	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 1A	No
LIVE WELLington	FS96.78	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Pāihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.79	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Rod Bray	FS137.28	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation. WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Allow	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Catherine Penetto	474.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes the HRZ of Arlington Street. Considers that the District Plan encourages a variety of housing types, sizes and tenure which will be lost in Arlington Street without a zone change. CC-O3 (Urban form and scale) states that development should be consistent with the strategic goal (5) of a natural environment protected, enhanced and integrated into the urban environment. Without a zone change, the very small reserve at the corner of Arlington and Torrens Terrace, enjoyed by locals for its sunshine, could be overshadowed by high-rise development.	Rezone the part of Arlington Street currently occupied by privately owned housing from High Density Residential to General Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.211	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject	No
Christina Mackay	478.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the High Density Residential Zone (HDRZ) with the height limit of 21m will effectively promote the demolition of neighbouring 2 – 3 storey character housing due to unacceptable close over-shadowing. The Medium Density Residential Zone and rules should apply in all areas of expanded inner residential character areas.	Seeks rezoning of High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone in all areas of expanded inner residential character areas. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	Yes

High Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Escape Investments Limited	484.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that the high density residential zoning walkable catchment for the City Centre should revert back to 15 minutes in line with the NPS-UD objectives.</p> <p>This will bring selected parts of Oriental Bay within the high residential zone, which given its access and proximity to the city, will allow it to grow with a variety of housing types and meet the demands of the changing city.</p> <p>Auckland has adopted a 15 minute walkable catchment.</p> <p>WCC reducing the walkable catchment size creates issues around less potential supply surrounding the CCZ, essential and service industry workers priced out of the city, and is unresponsive of the climate.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Amend the High Density Residential Zoning around the City Centre to cover the increased 15 minute walkable catchment suggested by this submission.	Accept in part	Yes
Ann Mallinson	FS3.18	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow	Accept in part	Yes
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.20	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that a limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for eg in Hay Street).	Disallow	Accept in part	Yes
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.22	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Opposes those parts of Escape Investments Ltd's submission that seeks to extend the walkable catchment above 10 minutes.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Helen Foot	FS62.20	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow	Accept in part	Yes
Don Mackay	FS94.20	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Reasons for opposing extension of walkable catchment beyond 10 mins are set out above in relation to Property Council : Considers that a limit of ten minutes on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington, and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last five minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for Wilkinson Street). People's propensity to walk decreases with distance.	Disallow	Accept in part	Yes
Investore Property Limited	405.16	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the provision of a broad area of six storey High Density Residential zoning in the wider Johnsonville catchment. Submitter considers that this gives effect to the NPS-UD and reflects the status of Johnsonville as a Metropolitan Centre.	Retain High Density Residential Zoning within the wider Johnsonville catchment as notified.	Accept in part	No
(Vivien) Jane Kirkcaldie and Denis Maxwell Kirkcaldie	455.1	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>Opposes the creation of canyons within the submitters' area (the Botanic Gardens and Bolton St Cemetery, the motorway and the cable car track), from multi-floor buildings.</p> <p>Considers that the area is steep and hilly, subject to seismic activity as the city in general, and the service infrastructure is old.</p>	Not specified.	No decision sought	No
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.20	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that Wesley Precinct and Lower Kelburn, the area between Bolton St to San Sebastian Rd or the cable car, and between the Botanic Gardens and the Motorway should be classified as a Character Precinct with demolition controls and height limit of 11m for the many reasons outlined the submission and others referred to in further submission, including that of Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood, submission 356.	Allow	No decision sought	No
Vivienne Morrell	155.5	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that HRZ new six-storey buildings will make existing neighbours' houses shadier, damper, less healthy, and unpleasant to live in.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Vivienne Morrell	155.6	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that design requirements for multi-unit residential developments should be strengthened to future-proof buildings and provide for good community experience. Considers that the provisions for recession planes, privacy, outlook space and solar access (HRZ-S3, HRZ-S14, and HRZ-S15) are very limited and simply not adequate, given the buildings in the HRZ can go right to site boundaries.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No