

# **Wellington City Proposed District Plan**

## **REPORT 2A**

### **APPENDIX 3.1**

#### **Recommended Responses to Submissions and Further Submissions**

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Gregory Webber	33.4	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Green Street has houses primarily built in the 1890's and very early 1900's and you cannot bring these houses back once they're gone.  Green Street housing is of the same era and aesthetic as the upper part of Wilson Street and Coromandel Street which are classified as heritage areas.	Seeks that the housing in Green Street has the same protection as Coromandel Street and Wilson Street.	See Character section of report and appendix.	
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.216	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	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	See Character section of report and appendix.	
Michael Harvey	38.1	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Seeks that "Sausage Flats" are actively discouraged through the MDRS in the District Plan, in a similar fashion to Auckland City Council.	Not specified	Reject	No
Peter Hill	41.1	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the Ministry for the Environment and Ministry of Housing and Urban Development are concerned about the effects of tall apartment blocks immediately adjacent to zones of much smaller housing.  Considers that WCC does not follow the directives of the NPS-UD with respect to sensible zoning patterns when establishing the boundaries of the character precincts within the High Density Residential Zone.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan zoning patterns, in establishing the boundaries of Character Precincts within a High Density Residential Zone, adhere more closely to the points 1, 3 and 5 in Figure 11 "Sensible Zoning Patterns" of the Ministry for the Environment document: Understanding and Implementing Intensification Provisions for the NPS-UD. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Peter Hill	41.2	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the 11 blocks split between character precincts and the HDRZ in Mt Cook result in fragmentation of the suburb.	Seeks that Figure 1 (Peter Hill Submission to Proposed District Plan 26-8-22) is an example plan for the re-drawing of Character Precinct boundaries in Mount Cook.  [Refer to original submission]	Reject	No
Peter Hill	41.3	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that Table 2.21 of the Wellington Regional Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment (Demand and capacity comparison by housing type and by housing catchment 2021-2051) shows that the capacity for Inner Wellington exceeds the demand, it should be practicable to redraw the Character Precinct boundaries.	Seeks that the Character Precincts boundaries for Mount Cook are redrawn to create the type of sensible zoning pattern outlined by the Ministry for the Environment.	Addressed in Report 2B Accepted in Part	Yes
Peter Hill	41.4	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that the PDP protects only 28.8% of the previous character areas while the equivalent Auckland plan protects about 75% which has not raised any objections from the Ministry for the Environment or the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development.	Not specified.	Addressed in Report 2B	
Peter Hill	41.5	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that based on a site-by-site examination of Mt Cook brownfield areas, this yields a total area of 4.1884ha and at an uptake rate of 30% at least 300 new dwellings could be built in the potential brownfield sites identified in Figure 2 (Plan showing Potential Brownfield Sites in the Suburb of Mt Cook (excluding Adelaide Road area)). [Refer to original submission including attachments "Housing Notes - Mt Cook" and "Mt Cook - Brownfield Sites Survey" for full calculations].  Considers that as the estimated growth figures of additional dwellings for Mount Cook is 79-174 over 30 years [refer to Table 2: Inner Suburbs Estimated Growth Figures in original submission] this growth could be met by development in the potential brownfield sites alone.	Seeks that Figure 2 - Plan showing Potential Brownfield Sites in the Suburb of Mt Cook (excluding Adelaide Road area) support the practicability of a sensible zoning pattern for Mount Cook.	Reject	No
James Barber	56.2	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Support	Supports intensification in the residential zones	Seeks that the residential intensification enabled by the PDP is approved	Accept in Part	No
Conor Hill	76.23	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that limiting dwellings is anti-people.  Considers that dwelling-per-section limits fail to take into account dwelling size.	Seeks that the limit of three dwellings per site are deleted in every zone.	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.54	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Considers the submission point is inconsistent with the NPS-UD and MDRS.	Disallow	Accept	No
LIVE WELLington	FS96.88	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	This would be inconsistent with the NPS-UD and MDRS	Disallow	Accept	No

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Judith Graykowski	80.2	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that dwellings built to the site boundaries are poor quality places and should require some transition from street to doorway.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Rowan Hannah	84.1	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Considers that the changes to the District Plan (specifically intensification provisions) will change the look and feel of the rural area and opposes medium density development in this area.	Seeks that intensification is not enabled in the General Rural Zone.	Reject	No
Interprofessional Trust	96.3	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the operative District Plan does not follow best practice with respect to medium density housing and that the PDP must rectify this.  [Refer to original submission for further detail].	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to follow international best practice with respect to medium density housing.  [refer to submission for further details]	Reject	No
Interprofessional Trust	96.4	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the recession plane provisions in the operative District Plan are inappropriate and that these must be accepted as mistakes and removed.  [Refer to original submission for further details]	Seeks that the recession plane (Height in Relation to Boundary) standards are removed from the Proposed District Plan.	Reject	No
Interprofessional Trust	96.5	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that indoor-outdoor ambience should be provided to evert dwelling.	Seeks limits for indoor-outdoor ambience be imposed as set out in the submission.	Reject	No
Kate Zwartz	110.1	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Considers that preserving neighbourhood character and access to sunlight is important, and that controls are needed on how well high density is built.	Seeks reconsideration of loss of heritage protections and of the blanket 21m height limits in the central suburbs.	Reject	No
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.39	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Support	Supports submission that seeks to extend character precincts in Newtown.	Allow	Reject	No
Gael Webster	114.2	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the WCC should only implement rules providing for the minimum intensification required by the government's new legislation.	Seeks that more qualifying matters are provided to give greater protection of heritage/character/townscape and amenity values (particularly sunshine hours on dwellings).	Reject	No
Braydon White	146.10	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the MRZ is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject	No
Braydon White	146.11	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what is proposed.	Reject	No
Braydon White	146.12	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.	Reject	No
Braydon White	146.13	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that 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
Braydon White	146.14	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that universal accessibility should be a non-negotiable for all developments.	Seeks that universal accessibility is a non-negotiable for all developments.	Reject	No

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Vivienne Morrell	155.4	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the PDP will see a random scattering of six-or higher-storey tower blocks in what are largely one and two storey residential suburbs, with those blocks dominating and shading existing neighbours. The potential for poor health outcomes, poor housing and resentment of occupants is considerable.	Seeks that a transition zone next to heritage buildings and character precincts is created.	Accepted in Part.	Yes
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
Vivienne Morrell	155.7	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that it is a particular issue if a new building blocks the sunlight from existing solar panels on a neighbour's property.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Vivienne Morrell	155.8	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that dwellings built to the site boundaries are poor quality places and should require some transition from street to doorway.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Jill Ford	163.8	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that all new multiunit developments include public outdoor green space suitable for children.	Reject	No
Amos Mann	172.16	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that we need to re-invent how we house ourselves. We cannot know exactly what flavour of new housing approaches will come to the fore over this period of change, but we do know that what we have now isn't working for 90% of our community members throughout the majority of their lives.  Considers that these alternative housing solutions are not only excellent viable solutions to housing affordability barriers but also, if well planned for by council, are solutions to reducing the climate change and environmental impacts of single family traditional housing because they can use much less land per occupant and less building materials per occupant.  In addition, well-planned co-living is a viable solution for increasing social cohesion.  [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that the District Plan empower the development of a wide range of diverse and varied housing types in all residential zones, including co-housing, tiny housing, and Papakāinga projects.	Reject	No
Ros Bignell	186.6	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Supports and welcomes new residential building that is well designed and complementary to the current streetscape of Newtown.	Seeks that new residential building that is well designed and complementary to the current streetscape of Newtown.	Reject	No
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.24	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Support	Supports submission seeking that character protections should extend to Lawrence Street, Newtown.	Allow	Reject	No
Michael O'Rourke	194.4	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that height zoning should be applied more microscopically and be graduated based on neighbourhood, topography, and position on block in order to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties.	Seeks that height zoning should be applied more microscopically and be graduated based on neighbourhood, topography, and position on block to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties.	Reject	No
Mary-Anne O'Rourke	195.4	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Considers that it is contradictory to permit building intensification in the Kilbirnie, Lyall Bay, and Miramar suburbs, which are flood and tsunami prone, when the Government are not willing to invest in transport infrastructure (light rail) in the area due to its environmental vulnerability.  In addition, the aging and unmaintained infrastructure will not tolerate this level of housing intensification.	Seeks that building intensification is reduced in the Eastern Suburbs area.  [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.7	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Supports densification when it is "done well" and fairly distributed across the entire city.	Seeks that densification is distributed across the entire city and that six-storey buildings are not concentrated in Crofton Downs, Ngaio, and Khandallah.  [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.8	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that the likes of Ngaio and Khandallah could benefit from some degree of densification to provide more local amenities and socio-cultural facilities, but this needs to be designed and executed well with constraint or consideration for the impacts on the community.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.9	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that the housing crisis cannot be solved purely through increased supply alone. If new housing is not "affordable" and there are no controls on who can purchase all of this new housing supply, it is highly likely that a large percentage of new housing will be purchased by rent-seeking landlords, who will continue to push up rent costs.	Seeks that the WCC stipulate a certain percentage of newly built dwellings to be classed as "affordable".	Reject	No
Russell Taylor	224.1	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the requirement to ensure all residential properties have north facing sunlight and no property can shade adjacent properties needs to be strengthened.	Reject	No
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.12	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that demolishing many functional wooden buildings to replace them with steel and concrete high-rises will create excessive landfill and excessive carbon emissions with consequent burdens on future generations.	Seeks that well-functioning older housing should be retained as much as possible to avoid landfill waste and reduce carbon emissions.	Reject	No
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.13	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that homes should be warm, dry places of stability where natural sunlight, mood enhancing benefits and areas of open space are recognised as essential to human wellbeing.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.14	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Because the first areas to be intensified will be at the whim of developers, well-functioning, established heritage and character housing such as Lower Kelburn will be among the first to be demolished as an investment opportunity.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.15	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan be amended to make greater provision for limited notification in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours.	Reject	No
Victoria Stace	235.2	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that yard setbacks enable adjacent property owners of wooden structures gain access for repairs and maintenance to their structures.	Seeks that yard setbacks of at least 1.5m front yard and 1m side yard are required in all residential zones.	Reject	No
Alan Fairless	242.12	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that throughout the city are many sites that sit idle or underutilised. Developing these sites provides a means to addressing much of the future housing demand while avoiding adverse effects on quality, amenity and character.  [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that the District Plan sets out a clear sequence for intensification that focusses first on major areas of underutilised land and smaller groups of underutilised sites close to public transport, rather than upzoning broad areas of land.	Reject	No
Alan Fairless	242.13	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the District Plan is amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect of urban design to ensure that quality in design at a local level can be considered for the majority of developments.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities.	Reject	No
Alan Fairless	242.14	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that current proposals only develop 14% of rezoned areas. LIVE Wellington want to see partnerships that will develop at least 50% of underutilised land in the next ten years.	Seeks that the District Plan identify areas suitable for intensification and provide a timetable for developing masterplans for these areas, including quality design guides and rapid assessment processes for sites within these areas.	Reject	No
Alan Fairless	242.15	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the District Plan more comprehensively provide for enhanced sunlight access to outdoor and indoor living areas.	Reject	No

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Steve Dunn	288.5	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Does not support having a blanket provision enabling 3 units up to 3 storeys or multi unit buildings up to 6 storeys and considers this contrary to the objective of providing a liveable well-functioning urban environment.	Seeks that an urban development plan, specific to the local area be developed as a refined response and would allow for intensive development in specific areas that consider the immediate surroundings, topography, local character, and ecology.	Reject	No
Steve Dunn	288.6	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that Newtown is suited to 3-4 storey housing along its transport spine [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that building heights in central Newtown are amended to 3-4 storeys.  [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Steve Dunn	288.7	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that to meet the objectives of a healthy living environment, the plan is amended to protect sunlight access for all outdoor living areas, not just public open space, as well as solar panels on roofs.	Seeks that the plan is amended to protect sunlight access for all outdoor living areas, not just public open space, as well as solar panels on roofs.	Reject	No
Phillippa O'Connor	289.14	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Support	Supports restricted discretionary status for breached standards, rather than a broader discretionary status.	Retain approach where a standard is breached that a restricted discretionary activity status is used.	Accept	No
Tawa Community Board	294.15	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Concerned about the transition edges between areas of differing permitted density not being addressed nor the effect of topography in Tawa.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Matthew Plummer	300.3	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that there is insufficient infrastructure to deliver the significant uplift in housing that Wellington needs.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Matthew Plummer	300.4	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers WCC should enable infrastructure development in the form of big apartment buildings in areas like Adelaide Road, Cambridge Terrace and Kent Terrace, in similar fashion to what has been done on Victoria Street.  The Proposed District Plan in its current form will not incentivise development of affordable homes.	Seeks that infrastructure development be incentivised on Adelaide Road, Cambridge Terrace and Kent Terrace.	Reject	No
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.3	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the proposed set-back provisions of the Draft District Plan should be reinstated. Requiring developments on narrow streets to have to step back as they rose higher would stop the obliteration of daylight and sunlight to the residents on lower levels. This was a vitally important step to take and should not have been removed from the Proposed District Plan.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Draft District Plan's set-back provisions be reinstated for City Centre Zones.	Addressed in Hearing Stream 4.	
Roland Sapsford	305.30	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the zoning applied to parts of Aro Valley in the PDP reflects historical errors that have been carried over from the ODP.  [Refer to original submission for details]	Seeks that historical errors are corrected by relief sought in submission.	Addressed in Hearing Stream 4.	
James Coyle	307.5	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Opposes the current change for Multi-Unit properties from 4-hour winter sunlight to living areas to 1 hour daylight to living areas.	Seeks that the 4-hour sunlight requirement for living areas from the Operative Plan Residential Design Guide be reinstated.	Reject	No
James Coyle	307.6	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers Newtown should have special zones dedicated to intensive development, such as terraced housing blocks and plazas. These zones could be brownfield and part of centre zones. For instance, the area opposite the entry to the zoo with borders of Owen, Daniell and Manchester.	Seeks that Newtown have special zones dedicated to intensive development to create terraced housing blocks and plazas.	Reject	No
James Coyle	307.7	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that building topologies should not be mixed too much.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
James Coyle	307.8	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that over shadowing and overlooking should be minimised.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
James Coyle	307.9	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers there needs to be a maximum height for single dwellings that is much lower than for multi-unit. The demographic of Newtown is changing and outcome may be large houses that have car parking underneath and that build high to access views.	Seeks that the maximum height for single dwellings is much lower than for multi-unit.	Reject	No
Penelope Borland	317.7	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	See Report 2B.	
Penelope Borland	317.8	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the PDP should include sunlight provisions in all residential zone housing areas, rather than a minimum of 2 hours of daylight.	Seeks that Residential Zones include sunlight provisions for housing areas.	Reject	No
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.24	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	It would be useful to have clarity on how low decks and eaves are to be treated in relation to setbacks - exclusion of decks no more than 500mm above ground and also eaves up to 600mm (as applying at b & c in the Makara Beach & Makara Village precinct) could usefully be applied generally.	Clarify how low decks and eaves will be treated in the residential zones.	Accept	Yes
Bruce Crothers	319.16	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that planning for new housing and rural areas should include the implementation of wildlife corridors including encouragement to restore the Queens chain to public access.	Seeks that wildlife corridors and access to the Queen's chain be taken into account when planning for new housing.	This point will be addressed in Hearing Stream 7.	
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.10	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that residential zones in Mt Cook may get too much shading from neighbouring City Centre Zones. Private properties should benefit from the same shading limits as green places. The proposed plan has constraints on shading green areas, other than very limited recession plane requirements, but nothing to limit the shading of private properties.	Seeks that constraints be developed to prevent City Centre Zones from shading private properties, in similar fashion to constraints in place for Open Space Zones.	Addressed in Hearing Stream 4	
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.99	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	[Not specified].	Disallow	Addressed in Hearing Stream 4	
Property Council New Zealand	338.9	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that residential standards meant for new apartments and townhouses to be pleasant places to live in could have unintended consequences if not worked closely with the sector.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.23	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that some measure of minimum floor space per person should be required to avoid tiny low-quality spaces for people to live in.	Seeks that minimum residential unit size standards include a measure of minimum floor space per person.	Accept in part	No
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.24	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that housing needs to provide a high standard of accessibility, because 25% of New Zealanders will be over 65 by 2030 and 25% of New Zealanders have a disability.	Seeks that housing provide a high standard of accessibility.	Reject	No
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.25	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that developments with oppressive street frontages, like garages, are impediments to community connection, and should be discouraged in the District Plan's design rules.	Seeks that developments with oppressive street frontages be discouraged.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.384	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose in part	Seeks reinsertion of the deleted SNAs in the residential zones, and the provisions protecting them, and apply the ECO provisions to these zones.	Amend GRUZ-P2 (Keeping of goats):  Provide for the keeping of goats outside of significant natural areas in the General Rural Zone where they are contained and managed to avoid adverse ecological effects within identified significant natural areas	This point will be addressed in Hearing Stream 8	

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.158	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes amendments as this may impact on residential intensification outcomes.	Disallow	This point will be addressed in Hearing Stream 8	
Inner City Wellington	352.2	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that the current level of intensification already occurring is exacerbating the existing deficit in amenities available to inner-city residents living in 'vertical streets.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Inner City Wellington	352.3	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that the plan may not be able to directly influence and improve Sunlight protection.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Inner City Wellington	352.4	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that the plan may not be able to directly influence and improve Diversity of Inner City Neighbourhoods.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
John Bryce	354.1	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that WCC should develop special rules for areas like Aro Valley where one size building rules will result in poor quality and unhealthy dwellings. For example, six story buildings are totally inappropriate in many parts of Aro Valley where they would block the small amount of winter sunshine from nearby property.  Considers that sunshine is important for healthy living spaces, particularly in freestanding older wooden houses that do not benefit from the heated thermal mass that exists in concrete apartment buildings where sunlight may suffice.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan protects future inhabitants of dwellings by ensuring good quality living spaces.  [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.13	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that building height in relation to boundary, outdoor living spaces, landscaped areas, permeable surface area, minimum residential unit size and setbacks from any boundary, especially the street facing boundary might impact neighbouring properties and reduce the adjacent street's amenity, vibrancy and safety.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Waka Kotahi	370.258	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.	Seeks that Wellington City Council undertake further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.  [Inferred decision requested]	Addressed in Report 2B	No
Waka Kotahi	370.259	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.	Seeks that Wellington City Council undertake further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD. [Inferred decision requested]	Addressed in Report 2B	No
Waka Kotahi	370.260	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Submitter supports greater heights for multi-unit developments that are subject to resource consent.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.106	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	The submitter acknowledges that relief is not appropriate in relation to the construction and use of up to three dwellings per site. However, the submitter notes that residential amenity will be better protected for 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.	Amend the Residential Zones to ensure that larger-scale and higher-density residential developments are designed to managed reverse sensitivity where there is an interface with a commercial or Mixed-use Zone, or with lawfully established non-residential activities.  [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.46	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	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	FS126.14	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	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



General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.14	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	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
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.107	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	The submitter notes that several of the fuel companies assets are located in close proximity to residential zoned properties. The proposed changes to the residential zones have the potential to generate reverse sensitivity effects and amenity effects.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.318	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Support in part	Generally supportive of the proposals for medium density and high density residential zones. Minor suggestions made [further detail provided in later parts of submission and summarised below]	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.10	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that MRZ (Medium density residential zone) height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject	No
Sue Kedgley	387.3	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that there are numerous sites in the inner city which are ideal for high-rise buildings such as along main arterial routes such as Kent Terrace, Adelaide Road, Taranaki Street, Vivian Street and Te Aro flats.	Seeks that densification focuses on the areas such as along Kent Terrace, Adelaide Road, Taranaki Street, Vivian Street and Te Aro flats.	Reject	No
LIVE WELLington	FS96.52	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Prioritising Brownfield development is Supported There are strong economic & social benefits from concentrating development in Te-Aro and on the city fringes of inner-city suburbs close to main transport routes, on relatively flat ground and where renewal of 3 water infrastructure can be concentrated into a smaller area. This is a much better alternative than the propose scattergun approach of allowing 6-story apartment blocks to be built through the majority of the inner-city suburbs. By doing this, valuable heritage and innercity character areas could be retained while meeting the required housing need in Wellington at the same time.	Disallow	Reject	No
Sue Kedgley	387.4	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that there are numerous vacant or under-utilised commercial buildings in the city centre that could be converted and re-purposed into apartment blocks.  Valuable character areas comprised of pre-1930s wooden houses should be retained and high-rise development concentrated in the CBD.  By doing this, valuable heritage and inner-city character areas could be retained while meeting the required housing need in Wellington at the same time.	Seeks that densification focuses on the areas such as in the central city, where there are numerous vacant or under-utilised commercial buildings that could be converted and re-purposed into apartment blocks.	Reject	No
LIVE WELLington	FS96.53	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Prioritising Brownfield development is Supported There are strong economic & social benefits from concentrating development in Te-Aro and on the city fringes of inner-city suburbs close to main transport routes, on relatively flat ground and where renewal of 3 water infrastructure can be concentrated into a smaller area. This is a much better alternative than the propose scattergun approach of allowing 6-story apartment blocks to be built through the majority of the inner-city suburbs. By doing this, valuable heritage and innercity character areas could be retained while meeting the required housing need in Wellington at the same time.	Disallow	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.308	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that the residential intensification provisions in the Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential Zones should be reviewed to improve national and regional consistency and increase density and heights across the board. Residential intensification standards should be expanded to reflect an increase in intensification anticipated in and around centres and rapid transit stops, and where necessary introduce a new chapter.	Seeks that residential intensification provisions in the Medium Density Residential and High Density Residential Zones are reviewed to improve national and regional consistency and increase density and heights across the board.	Reject	No
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.22	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	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 in part	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.29	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	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 in part	No

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.309	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that where standards are not referenced in building and structure activity rules, an activity status should be provided for non-compliance with the standard. It is sought that this activity status in Residential Zones is a Restricted Discretionary to be consistent with the general approach throughout the Plan.	Seeks that where Residential Zone standards are not referenced in building and structure activity rules a Restricted Discretionary activity status is provided for non-compliance with the standard, to be consistent with the general approach throughout the Plan	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.310	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	The submitter has noted that as a result of their amendments requested for height adjustments there may be consequential changes needed to other standards such as wind and daylight standards.	Seeks that standards are amended across the plan to be proportionate to the building height changes sought in the submission.	Reject	No
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.31	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Considers that what is proposed will lead to an increase in building height.	Disallow	Reject	No
Stephen Minto	395.3	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that the historic low-rise suburbs of older wooden buildings are a character feature throughout Wellington that is of huge liveability and tourist value.	Not specified.	See Character section of report and appendix.	
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.497	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the Air Noise Boundary is amended to establish a policy framework where resource consents can be declined within existing residential zones for noise sensitive activities on reverse sensitivity grounds;	This point will be addressed in Hearing Stream 7.	
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.152	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought on the basis that adverse effects from noise can be appropriately managed and the concept of reverse sensitivity is not supported.	Disallow	This point will be addressed in Hearing Stream 7.	
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.152	Part 3 / Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow	This point will be addressed in Hearing Stream 7.	
Emma Osborne	410.7	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject	No
Emma Osborne	410.8	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what is proposed.	Reject	No

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Stephen Minto	FS100.17	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	<p>Submitter 234 wants to reduce shading as an issue when designing a development. But if people have solar panels on their house then this is an ongoing financial benefit that is lost. Compensation has not been considered or discussed in the submission. The criticality of sunlight to well being. It should be a right to have it in your house. It is known to help house sales so it has a value and the submitters place no value on it.</p> <p>Appreciates the submitter wants more houses and assumes they want affordable housing. Instead wants affordable housing and sees densification as having merits in the right places. Like in the brownfields of Te Aro. Not by ripping the heart out of our heritage/ character suburbs. Our heritage/chaacter suburbs are a finite asset that is special to NZ. Tourists talk about it being special and different. Our heritage is part of continuity with our past. And being connected to the past is a critical part of becoming aware of our identity as New Zealanders. Heritage gives us a sense of place. Our place. Try getting Parisians to pull down the Eiffel Tower now.</p> <p>Heritage buildings and character areas connect to the trees that covered our land and were destroyed. Respecting heritage houses gives us a chance to still see the beauty of their wood. The trees that are special to NZ. The Rimu reds, the various stains, the hardness of Matai. The connection to what makes NZ. So when we plant and replace it will mean a deeper understanding of the beauty that was destroyed. Protecting heritage therefore helps connect us to a better future and an awareness that we should not let that destruction happen again.</p> <p>Wellington has already lost most of its character and heritage from the central city. Lambton Quay destroyed but its no safer from earthquakes in fact less safe. Heritage and character just aren't looked after so they often are poor quality. Requiring them to be done up to an excellent standard would be cheaper and less carbon intensive than building new. Note: Cities can shape well being and happiness as well. They aren't just cost effective rooms to sleep in. [Inferred reference to submission point 234.7]</p>	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Emma Osborne	410.9	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	<p>Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for provding pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.</p>	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.	Reject	No
Stephen Minto	FS100.9	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	<p>Submtter 410 proposes the encouragement of 'Pop-up public realm's for dwellings shaded by developments. This is in effect telling people to go outside, to the beach or park if they want sun. Or a glass van will drive round and people can sit in it for 5 minutes before it drives away somewhere else. 'Closing time drink up ya tea'. That just doesn't match how people use their time, the independence of when you can relax. It's simply costly and silly.</p> <p>It is not even a viable proposal in the summer heat when you may want sun to warm the house or dry the clothes but not be in it. But especially in winter when sun is so important for comfort but it is still very cold outside. This heavily impacts the elderly and puts them at higher risk from illnesses. Wellington is not called windy for nothing.</p> <p>These suggestions take no account of how vulnerable some people feel outside and increases the chances of predatory behaviour onto the vulnerable.</p> <p>Every dwelling should be an excellent one and this submission does nothing for that. In theory even new developments could be overshadowed and it's just bad luck.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 410.9]</p>	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Donna Yule	421.1	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose	<p>Opposes the blanket policy of Medium Density 3 Storey Residential housing in all residential areas - the height limits are too high. Also no residential minimum boundaries space of at least 1 metre.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Many more 3 storey development means a whole suburb except for those on the hills will be in permanent shadows.</p> <p>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 the can afford to move elsewhere with sun &amp; outdoor space.</p>	Not specified.	No decision requested	No

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.15	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellington is a folded landscape with valleys and ridges, and this means that a single large dwelling in the wrong place can adversely affect many others.</p> <p>The PDP needs to allow and adjust for this reality by adopting a more carefully tailored and locally nuanced approach, rather than a one-size-fits-all approach if it is to avoid serious and long-lasting adverse impacts in Wellington.</p> <p>Considers that planning needs to drive and encourage quality and ensure the design of new, more intensive development works with the city's idiosyncratic landscape and for the communities in which it is located. We need local Design Guides, founded on a sophisticated understanding of local character, as a proven and effective vehicle for addressing good residential quality.</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan must more comprehensively 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 strengthen the urban design qualities of the city through a more sophisticated approach to design guidance, in particular the use of local design guides tailored to local areas.	Reject	No
Johnsonville Community Association	429.28	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	<p>Considers that the Spatial Plan/PDP proposes that over 2/3rds of population growth be absorbed into selected outer suburban areas while inner suburbs will take a much smaller impact. The experience of the Johnsonville MDRA shows that simply zoning residential areas for denser development does not lead to more housing or affordable housing. This is simply unsustainable to focus growth on a few suburbs as population growth needs to be supported across the city.</p> <p>Increasing the available residential accommodation close to the city centre is more likely to be attractive to new residents, as inner suburbs are more accessible by active modes and have more frequent and faster public transport services. Living in inner suburbs is attractive to many because they can access the vibrant city centre – including its work cultural and sporting opportunities – easily and efficiently, without clogging roads or wasting resources on transport unnecessarily.</p>	Seeks that the proposed district plan focuses on increasing available residential accommodation close to the city centre.	Reject	No
Johnsonville Community Association	429.29	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	<p>Considers that about half of the multi-level developments in Johnsonville have been built in breach of the MDRA planning rules but have been allowed because impacts were less than minor.</p> <p>Considers that there has been a breach of the WCC Planning Officers duty of care to consider and act to protect the best interests of home owners where residential developments do not comply with Council planning rules.</p> <p>The expectation with multi-unit developments is now that there will be non-notified permits for developments that exceed the limits of the PDP rules.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the criteria required for permitting non-compliant housing developments on a non-notified basis is more clearly outlined in the Proposed District Plan.	Reject	No
Johnsonville Community Association	429.30	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	<p>Considers that 3+ storey developments will render neighbouring homes less warm and dry.</p> <p>Considers whether council has fulfilled its fiduciary duty, duty of care obligation to affected residential home owners impacted by new building heights.</p>	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Newtown Residents' Association	440.15	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that allowing extensive redevelopment which removes the existing trees and other plants in Newtown's backyards does permanent damage to the natural bio-diversity of the area. Private gardens comprise the greatest proportion of green space in urban environments, so their potential to contribute to biodiversity is significant</p>	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Ingrid Downey	443.1	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	<p>Considers that the existing provisions relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan should be retained rather than replacing them with the minimum daylight provisions in the PDP.</p> <p>Keeping the Operative Plan provisions will ensure a minimum level of quality - and humanity - will be maintained in our new homes.</p> <p>Considers that light is fundamental to our well-being, and shading is far more than simply a minor issue. Reductions in sunlight can and do affect: heating and light cost; dampness; the ability to dry clothes outside and grow food; and mental well-being.</p>	<p>Seeks that the existing provisions relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan are reinstated in the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject	No
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.17	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	<p>Considers that a height limit of 11m on properties bordering the town belt will lead to a loss of character over time and will degrade the natural backdrop that the town belt provides for the City.</p>	Amend the rules (and associated objectives and policies) so that a height limit of 8m is applied to all properties bordering the town belt.	Reject	No
Ben Barrett	479.21	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	<p>Considers that Constable Street is not a major transport corridor.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that appropriate building planning needs to be had along Constable Street, varying in height, with building heights reducing as the elevation of the road rises.	Reject	No

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Catharine Underwood	481.21	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that design requirements for multi-unit residential developments regarding sunshine and shading need to be strengthened or made mandatory to future-proof buildings and provide for good community experience. New 22m, 14m and 11m storey blocks will make existing neighbouring houses shadier, damper, less healthy, and unpleasant to live in. A particular issue is if a new building blocks sunlight from existing solar panels on a neighbour's property.	Seeks that provisions for multi-unit developments be stricter in regards to the shade they can cast.	Reject	No
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.46	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that many people are concerned about multi-unit developments not providing the sort of quality, privacy and amenity that a house in its own section can. That is not true if the units are well-designed.	Seeks that new and altered multi-unit developments have good design that provides privacy. [Inferred that the decision requested refers to multi-unit developments].	Reject	No
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.47	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Not specified.	Seeks that new and altered multi-unit developments are accessible. [Inferred that the decision requested refers to multi-unit developments].	Reject	No
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.48	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Not specified.	Seeks that new and altered multi-unit developments have outside spaces including for clothes drying. [Inferred that the decision requested refers to multi-unit developments].	Reject	No
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.49	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Not specified.	Seeks that new and altered multi-unit developments include storage and bike parking. [Inferred that the decision requested refers to multi-unit developments].	Reject	No
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.50	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Not specified.	Seeks that new and altered multi-unit developments provide green space both private and communal. [Inferred that the decision requested refers to multi-unit developments].	Reject	No
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.51	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Not specified.	Seeks that new and altered multi-unit developments be insulated for noise and energy efficiency. [Inferred that the decision requested refers to multi-unit developments].	Reject	No
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.52	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Not specified.	Seeks that new and altered multi-unit developments have access to daylight. [Inferred that the decision requested refers to multi-unit developments].	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.73	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Not specified	Considers that there are inconsistencies in the zoning and identifying of rapid transit stops across the region. Concerned about the impact this will create in the future.	Not specified.	This matter was addressed in Hearing Stream 1.	
Jonathan Markwick	490.14	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Support	Supports the increase in height controls in the Mt Cook area.	Retain the building height controls in the Mt Cook area as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in Part	No
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.14	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that in MRZ-PREC02-01 (Purpose), as "townscape values" is not a defined term - only "townscape" is and the definition does not greatly assist with clarifying what values are at stake - much relies on the further planning framework, and the design guide in particular to protect the precinct.	Seeks that a definition of "Townscape values" is provided.	Reject	No
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.2	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY GARDEN	Amend	Submitter questions whether this definition should provide for composting up to a certain threshold in order to align with MRZ-P14.	Amend the definition of 'Community Garden' to clarify whether community gardens should provide for composting up to a certain threshold in order to align with MRZ-P14.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'residential unit' will be applicable to some units within retirement villages. In some cases, it will be necessary for the Proposed Plan to distinguish between a residential unit and a retirement unit. Seeks that a new definition of 'residential unit' is inserted.	Add new definition for RETIREMENT UNIT as follows: <u>means any unit within a retirement village that is used or designed to be used for a residential activity (whether or not it includes cooking, bathing and toilet facilities). A retirement unit is not a residential unit.</u>	Reject	No
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	Amend	Considers that there needs to be a definition for organic composting in order to provide for the composting of household food waste on a city-wide scale.	Add a new definition for 'Organic Composting'.	Reject	No

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.4	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ACCESSORY BUILDING	Support	Supports the definition for 'Accessory Building' as it best defines detached ancillary buildings that excludes any minor residential unit.	Retain the definition of "accessory building" as notified.	Accept	No
Grant Buchan	143.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that where restrictions in the Spatial Plan are inconsistent with the NPS-UD and MDRS they should be removed, even if these were present in the Spatial Plan.	Seeks that height limits inconsistent with the NPS-UD (National Policy Statement on Urban Development) are removed.	Reject	No
Matthew Gibbons	148.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers there should be increased densification throughout Wellington, including in Character Precincts.	Supports the Proposed District Plan provisions that enable intensification.	Accept	No
Amos Mann	172.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that easier consenting and incentives for accessible and eco-friendly developments are provided for.	Reject	No
Wellington City Youth Council	201.12	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the consenting process is improved to support in-fill developments overcome logistical and delay challenges.	Reject	No
Glen Scanlon	212.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that retaining sunlight hour provisions from the operative district plan design guide will help ensure dry homes and a reasonable healthy quality of life for all.  Sunlight is important to mental health  Auckland's design rules also support maintaining and creating living environments where sunlight is maximised  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the proposed district plan retains the provisions for sunlight hours from the operative district plan design guides.	Reject	No
Eva Brodie	217.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that placement of even one tall building in this neighbourhood would degrade surrounding homes.  A non-compliant development has become compliant under the PDP which will severely impact sunlight on the submitters home, which is counterintuitive given New Zealand's push for healthier homes.  It does not make sense that a single dwelling can be allowed to have such a devastating impact on surrounding homes.  Developments built to the edge of zones in the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Lower Kelburn will mean losses of privacy, sun, views, and access.	Seeks that the plan is amended to put more emphasis on protecting neighbours sun access.	Reject	No
Anna Jackson	222.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks addition of a 30-40% permeability standard for all sites.	Reject	No
Anna Jackson	222.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks addition of a requirement for shared mini-parks and other forms of green spaces.	Reject	No
Anna Jackson	222.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks addition of a requirement for consideration of waste management to be factored into planning.	Reject	No
Anna Jackson	222.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks addition of a requirement for consideration of disability access to be factored into planning.	Reject	No
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	The heritage and culture of the urban landscape contributes to everyone's overall wellbeing and quality of life	Add a new objective as follows:  <u>Reflect the essential contributions made by heritage, character and quality design, giving us the ability to remember our heritage and to visually enjoy unique urban landscapes which provide character and a sense of belonging to our unique city.</u>	Reject	No
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that homes should be a warm, dry places of stability, where sunlight providing natural light and mood enhancing benefits are recognized as essential to human wellbeing.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan recognise the critical importance of sunlight to the wellbeing of residents.	Reject	No
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan ensure that current well-functioning established homes, neighbourhoods, old trees and plantings are not demolished.	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the PDP needs to enable mixed use in more areas so that people can access more services by walking.  Considers that the Vogeltown, Mornington, Kingston and Brooklyn suburbs lack suitable shops, supermarkets and restaurants.	Seeks that more mixed-use development is enabled in Vogeltown, Mornington, Kingston and Brooklyn	Reject	No
Alan Fairless	242.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan include an objective reflecting the positive contributions heritage, character and quality design, and the ability to read stories in the urban landscape, make to overall wellbeing.	Reject	No
Pauletta Wilson	257.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports more housing in Mount Cook but wants to see it done without loss of character and diversity.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Jim & Christine Seymour	262.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Supports more affordable and dense housing in central city areas but not at the risk of losing established character areas.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that the PDP needs to adequately give appropriate consideration to fire safety and operational firefighting requirements, particularly in relation to housing development and fire station development, including: - adequate access and water supply for new developments and subdivisions to ensure the submitter can efficiently and effectively respond to emergencies; and - the ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies; and - the ability to undertake training for firefighters within the region.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the level of high density development in Newtown is inappropriate because of the constraint around the Three Waters.  Considers that the upgrading of Wellingtons Three Water infrastructure has not kept up with demand and levels of service have reduced.  Newtown in particular has high need for network upgrades and investment into Three Waters.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the level of high density development of Newtown be reduced.	Accept in Part	Yes
Roland Sapsford	305.6	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that light is fundamental to wellbeing and the ability of people and communities to provide for their needs, and has concerns about reduction in sunlight.  Is concerned that removing the ability to address sun and shading issues on a site-specific basis will pose a risk to existing housing stock, as new houses positioned to maximise solar access will shade established houses.  Notes that reduction in sunlight can affect heating and lighting costs and mental wellbeing  Considers that houses built 100years ago rely on sunlight access to keep them in good condition.  Considers that a resource consent is a necessary means of assessing sunlight access in Aro Valley.  Considers that only one six storey building in an inappropriate location in Aro valley could result in widespread shading effects]  [Refer to original submission for details]	Seeks that the plan is amended to address sunlight and shading with particular reference to Aro Valley.	Reject	No
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.27	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow / Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.	Reject	No
Bruce Crothers	319.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Supports G99 to G102 (external bike storage) and considers that these should be carried into the PDP rules, policies and objectives.	Seeks that the content of G99 to G102 (external bike storage) is carried into the rules, policies and objectives.	Reject	No
Richard Murcott	322.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that Council should recognise the value of the inner city suburbs which has been achieved through the two decades of Operative District Plan, rather than jeopardising the gains in these relatively small enclaves of the city.	Not specified.	Reject	No
Joan Fitzgerald	323.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that G99-102 (External bike storage) of the Residential Design Guide be referenced in the specific rules, policies and objectives.	Reject	No
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the plan leaves much of the city's environment vulnerable to demolition with no guarantee of quality and/or affordable development in its place.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.38	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports submission because it is considered it is against demolition of pre-1930s homes because of the high CO2 emissions resulting and also from re-building with new materials.  Council should control demolition of old buildings and seek to renovate and repurpose them to reduce CO2 emissions.	Allow	Reject	No
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.9	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that rules and guidance to ensure density is done well must be embedded into the District Plan before removal of the pre-1930s rule. The status quo around design rules is not working well, with too much discretion allowed. Council officers need unambiguous design rules to guide them around Density Done Well, but currently suffer from the lack of them – there is enormous community interest in being part of the development of design rules that will guide building in our city.	Seeks more rules on design density.	Reject	No
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.12	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that the viewshaft from Matairangi Mt Victoria over the city towards Te Ahumairangi, Brooklyn and Mt Albert will be greatly diminished if the building heights are realised at the levels imagined in the proposed District Plan. There have already been a number of encroachments on the Matairangi Mt Victoria town belt to support private development.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Roseneath Residents' Association	FS49.9	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports the approach of the MVRA submission, which seeks to protect and enhance the townscape of Mount Victoria. While MVRA particularly stresses the importance of protecting the much admired townscape of suburban housing on the lower to mid slopes of the hill, the submitter also agrees with the MVRA submission's reference to 'soft fringes' against the Town Belt, the importance of green and open spaces, and the iconic values of the wider views of Mount Victoria. The submitter particularly supports the reference to special protection being needed for 'Mt Victoria bush and lookout - Town Belt' and 'There have already been a number of encroachments on the Matairangi - Mt Victoria town belt to support private development.'  Supporting MVRA's reference to special protection for Mount Victoria bus and lookout – Town Belt' and avoiding further intrusions into what is read visually as Town Belt and the critical Mount Victoria Ridgeline, the submitter requests that protection for Mount Victoria Lookout is achieved by number 22 Alexandra Road retaining the Open Space zoning and Ridgeline and Hilltops protection status as it is in the Operative District Plan.  [Inferred reference to submission point 342.12]	Allow		
Matthew Wells, Adelina Reis and Sarah Rennie	FS50.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Supports the approach of the MVRA submission, which seeks to protect and enhance the townscape of Mount Victoria. While MVRA particularly stresses the importance of protecting the much admired townscape of suburban housing on the lower to mid slopes of the hill, we also agree with their submission's reference to 'soft fringes' against the Town Belt, the importance of green and open spaces, and the iconic values of the wider views of Mount Victoria. The submitter particularly supports the reference to special protection being needed for 'Mt Victoria bush and lookout - Town Belt' and 'There have already been a number of encroachments on the Matairangi - Mt Victoria town belt to support private development.'  Supporting MVRA's reference to special protection for Mount Victoria bush and lookout – Town Belt' and avoiding further intrusions into what is read visually as Town Belt and the critical Mount Victoria Ridgeline, the submitter requests that protection for Mount Victoria Lookout is achieved by number 22 Alexandra Road retaining the Open Space zoning and Ridgeline and Hilltops protection status as it is in the Operative District Plan.  [Inferred reference to submission point 342.12]	Allow	Reject	No
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.14	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified.	Considers that the PDP encourages gentrification and the imminent moving on of more vulnerable residents from Mt Victoria. Removal of the pre-1930s rule will only speed that up, as more land under older rental properties is made available for development.	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.16	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the plan should account for the impacts of development surrounding schools, hospitals and hospices on access to sunlight and warmth.	Seeks that access to sunlight and warmth in schools, hospitals and hospice be protected from neighbouring tall developments.	Reject	No
Carolyn Stephens	344.3	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that limited notification should be prioritised in provisions (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that limited notification provisions be prioritised over non-notification, especially in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects.	Reject	No
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.25	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow / Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.	Reject	No
Elizabeth Nagel	368.4	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the PDP should have an objective reflecting the positive contributions heritage, character and quality design, and the ability to read stories in the urban landscape, make to overall wellbeing.	Seeks that an objective be added to recognise the positive contributions of heritage, character and quality design to overall wellbeing.	Reject	No
Elizabeth Nagel	368.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that limited notification should be prioritised in provisions (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks greater provision for limited notification provisions over non-notification, especially in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects.	Reject	No
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.26	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow / Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.7	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that Public notification preclusions should be included in the PDP where impacts may apply beyond the site being developed such as side yards, height, daylight, coverage.	Seeks that the preclusion of public notification is applied beyond a development site, for breaches such as side yards, height, daylight and coverage.	Reject	No
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.34	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Stride supports these submission points for the reasons provided by the primary submitter. Stride supports precluding notification where it is unlikely to be helpful to the decision-maker (for example, where the consent breach is of a technical nature and any effects are likely to be limited to the subject site or identified surrounding sites).	Allow	Reject	No
Investore Property Limited	FS108.34	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Investore supports these submission points for the reasons provided by the primary submitter. Investore supports precluding notification where it is unlikely to be helpful to the decision maker (for example, where the consent breach is of a technical nature and any effects are likely to be limited to the subject site or identified surrounding sites).	Allow	Reject	No



General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ben Barrett	479.10	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Considers that Newtown is unfairly targeted for the highest of intensification. All of Wellington should be subject share the same intensity goals.	Opposes the level of intensification in Newtown. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in Part	Yes
Ben Barrett	479.11	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the District Plan will ensure building heights are tiered and not haphazard.	Reject	No
Ben Barrett	479.14	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the District Plan will include: a) protections for existing property owners to prevent overshadowing from new multi-story buildings, or b) current market rate compensation options for existing property owners that are overshadowing from new multi-story buildings.	Reject	No
Ben Barrett	479.17	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the District Plan promotes better use of land and urban space by allowing boundary sharing (of walls or partitions on the boundary) if both parties are in agreement.	Accept	No
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that there should also be provision for requiring that significant developments that do not in themselves contribute to pedestrian amenity make a financial contribution towards that	Add a new provision requiring that significant developments that do not in themselves contribute to pedestrian amenity make a financial contribution towards that.	Reject	No
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.20	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that too many buildings have blank walls, high and solid fences or frontages dominated by spaces such as carparks. This makes these spaces less safe for walkers.	Seeks that buildings are designed so as not to have blank walls and high and solid fences or frontages dominated by spaces such as carparks. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Scots College Incorporated	117.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers that the maps do not identify the Scots College Campus for the purpose of recognising and providing for Scots College activities and the development of the Campus.	Opposes the removal of the Educational Precinct notation for Scots College.	Reject	No
Scots College Incorporated	117.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the Scots College Campus should be an Educational Precinct.	Amend the District Plan map to identify the "Scots College Campus" as an Educational Precinct.	Reject	No
Scots College Incorporated	117.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the "Educational Precincts" in the Operative District Plan should be retained in the PDP for all existing Educational Precincts, being: · Scots College, Miramar · Samuel Marsden Collegiate School, Karori · Queen Margaret College, Thorndon · St Marks Church School, Basin Reserve.	Seeks that these schools are identified as Educational Precincts.	Reject	No
Michael O'Rourke	194.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that height zoning should be applied more microscopically and be graduated based on neighbourhood, topography, and position on block in order to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties.	Seeks that height zoning should be applied more microscopically and be graduated based on neighbourhood, topography, and position on block to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties.	Reject	No
Mary-Anne O'Rourke	195.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that it is contradictory to permit building intensification in the Kibbirnie, Lyall Bay, and Miramar suburbs, which are flood and tsunami prone, when the Government are not willing to invest in transport infrastructure (light rail) in the area due to its environmental vulnerability.  In addition, the aging and unmaintained infrastructure will not tolerate this level of housing intensification.	Amend the mapping to reduce building intensification in the Eastern Suburbs area.  [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.10	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support in part	Considers alternative zoning appropriate to enable the submitter's Kilmarston subdivision.  Considers that Large Lot Residential zoning and a small area of Medium Density Residential or equivalent zoning adjoining Silverstream Road would be appropriate.	Seeks, as an alternative, that: a) Large Lot Residential zoning and a small area of Medium Density Residential or: b) equivalent zoning adjoining Silverstream Road.	This point will be addressed in Hearing Stream 7 and 8.	
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.26	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to, in the alternative to WCC agreeing appropriate tenure issues over the SW NOSZ land, to rezone it Large Lot residential or part (5500m2) as MDRZ. These proposals fly in the face of the incredibly high natural values of this land and seem a poorly thought through rouse to force the hand of WCC to complete reserve purchase or contribution negotiations. The suggested MDRZ area of 5500m2 is on an incredibly steep south facing cross slopes with a narrow road frontage (5m) and difficult access over an old stream bed. Vegetation in this area also has high biodiversity values. Development here sandwiched in between high biodiversity WCC reserve land would be inappropriate.	Disallow	This point will be addressed in Hearing Stream 7 and 8.	
Jo McKenzie	FS64.26	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to, in the alternative to WCC agreeing appropriate tenure issues over the SW NOSZ land, to rezone it Large Lot residential or part (5500m2) as MDRZ. Considers that these proposals fly in the face of the incredibly high natural values of this land and seem a poorly thought through rouse to force the hand of WCC to complete reserve purchase or contribution negotiations. The suggested MDRZ area of 5500m2 is on an incredibly steep south facing cross slopes with a narrow road frontage (5m) and difficult access over an old stream bed. Vegetation in this area also has high biodiversity values.  Considers that development here sandwiched in between high biodiversity WCC reserve land would be inappropriate.	Disallow	This point will be addressed in Hearing Stream 7 and 8.	

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.20	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Oppose	Forest & Bird strongly opposes alternative zoning of land adjoining Silverstream Road to enable the submitter's Kilmarnock subdivision. The land adjoining Silverstream Road is a high-quality SNA (WC060) with some of the best primary forest remnants left within the city limits. Large Lot Residential zoning and a small area of Medium Density Residential or equivalent zoning adjoining Silverstream Road would be contrary to the ECO provisions of the plan and not give effect to policies 23 & 24 of the RPS or s6(c) and s31(1)(b)(iii) of the RMA.	Disallow	This point will be addressed in Hearing Stream 7 and 8.	
Andy Foster	FS86.46	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Oppose	Considers that it is not reasonable to allow for housing development to intrude into the land zoned Open Space and Rural in the Operative Plan. The landscape impacts would be substantial, both of any housing and of the road access. The impacts on vegetation would also be significant. Notes that the area of bush at the bottom of the site, immediately adjacent to and climbing up from Silverstream Road is of particularly high quality. The concept of putting housing or an access road through it would be entirely unreasonable. For all these reasons Andy Foster opposes any development in this area beyond a carefully designed reservoir.  [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.10]	Disallow	This point will be addressed in Hearing Stream 7 and 8.	
Newtown Residents' Association	440.8	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that the damaging environmental effects of high rise developments in established low rise communities should be considered as a specific overlay. (Option B)	Seeks that negative environmental effects of high rise development be considered as a specific overlay.	Reject	No
James and Karen Fairhall	160.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its comments on boundary setbacks: 'it is common for a side, rear or front boundary set back to provide space between buildings. Set-backs can be used to provide a degree of privacy separation between adjoining buildings, allow site access/ circulation or to address scale/dominance of buildings in relation to one another. Set backs in the order of 1-3m are common'.	Not specified.	No decision requested.	No
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its comments on boundary setbacks: 'it is common for a side, rear or front boundary set back to provide space between buildings. Set-backs can be used to provide a degree of privacy separation between adjoining buildings, allow site access/circulation or to address scale/dominance of buildings in relation to one another. Set backs in the order of 1-3m are common'.	Not specified.	No decision requested.	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	204.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the submission put forward by [Inferred] Newtown Residents Association	Not specified.	No decision requested.	No
Dougal and Libby List	207.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its comments on boundary setbacks: 'it is common for a side, rear or front boundary set back to provide space between buildings. Set-backs can be used to provide a degree of privacy separation between adjoining buildings, allow site access/circulation or to address scale/dominance of buildings in relation to one another. Set backs in the order of 1-3m are common'.	Not specified.	No decision requested.	No
Craig Forrester	210.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its comments on boundary setbacks: 'it is common for a side, rear or front boundary set back to provide space between buildings. Set-backs can be used to provide a degree of privacy separation between adjoining buildings, allow site access/circulation or to address scale/dominance of buildings in relation to one another. Set backs in the order of 1-3m are common'.	Not specified.	No decision requested.	No
Generation Zero Inc	254.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that at the time of preparing this submission, the impact assessment had not yet been made publicly available.  The section 32 report notes that at the time of publishing, the requisite detailed assessment has not yet been undertaken and will be published in approximately August 2022. Submitter was unable to comment on the adequacy of the impact assessment.  [see original submission]	Seeks the ability to make a further submission point on the assessment on the impacts of limiting development capacity through qualifying matters, when the assessment is available.  [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its comments on boundary setbacks: 'It is common for a side, rear or front boundary set back to provide space between buildings. Set-backs can be used to provide a degree of privacy separation between adjoining buildings, allow site access/circulation or to address scale/dominance of buildings in relation to one another. Set backs in the order of 1-3m are common'.	Not specified.	No decision requested.	No
Richard Murcott	322.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that new developments in the Thorndon area require resource consents, with notification clauses that provide for the community and neighbours to have a say on new developments.	Reject	No
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.5	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Seeks that the interest of the submitter in Shelly Bay is given recognition.	Seeks that the planning framework as set out in the consented Shelly Bay Masterplan and Design Guide is adopted as the default planning settings for the landholdings within the scope of the granted consents.	This point will be addressed in hearing Stream 3.	
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kōlle	FS2.2	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold the land it owned at Shelly Bay to The Wellington Company for a large development which was consented via the Special Housing Accords Act, thus denying the community any say on the consenting process. Community involvement should be ensured for the future though and the current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land should remain. A recent poll has shown that the wider Wellington public want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park centred on the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula already designated for a reserve by the Government.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have treated Shelly Bay solely as a commercial proposition despite disagreement by a large group of its members (Mau Whenua) who occupied the site and opposed its sale, wanting to uphold their cultural and spiritual connection to the land. Mau Whenua continue to oppose the sale of the land at Shelly Bay and should be included by the council in all decisions taken about its future.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.	This point will be addressed in hearing Stream 3.	
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.2	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold its holdings at Shelly Bay and are no longer, as claimed, 'significant landowners'. Their possible ownership interest in the peninsula as a whole through Right of First Refusal is confined to the Mt Crawford site as the adjacent 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been designated reserve by the government (the current landowner) and WCC since 2011.</p> <p>The local community, despite its active interest in and use of the bay, was shut out of all consultation during the resource consent process. It is critical that it be involved in all future decision making.</p> <p>The current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land is supported not only by the local community but by the wider Wellington public, as evidenced in the independent poll conducted for the group Buy Back the Bay by Research NZ, which showed that 78% of Wellingtonians want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park, which would also include the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula set aside by the government as a reserve in 2011.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have viewed Shelly Bay as a strictly commercial proposition and disavowed any cultural, historical and spiritual connection to the site. A substantial proportion of the iwi (mau whenua) have opposed and continue to oppose the sale of the site, and should be included by the council in all democratic decision making about the future of Shelly Bay.</p>	Disallow	This point will be addressed in hearing Stream 3.	
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.37	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow	This point will be addressed in hearing Stream 3.	

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.6	Other / Other / Other	Amend	<p>Considers that the height control area being amended to 27m appropriate, as it is the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent.</p> <p>Submitter seeks that that the planning framework as set out in the consented Shelly Bay Masterplan and Design Guide is adopted as the default planning settings for the landholdings within the scope of the granted consents. Notes that the granted resource consent is currently being implemented on site.</p>	<p>Seeks that any other such amendments that are most appropriate to address increasing permitted heights for Shelly Bay Taikuru. [Inferred decision requested]</p>	<p>This point will be addressed in hearing Stream 3.</p>	
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kōlle	FS2.3	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold the land it owned at Shelly Bay to The Wellington Company for a large development which was consented via the Special Housing Accords Act, thus denying the community any say on the consenting process. Community involvement should be ensured for the future though and the current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land should remain. A recent poll has shown that the wider Wellington public want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park centred on the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula already designated for a reserve by the Government.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have treated Shelly Bay solely as a commercial proposition despite disagreement by a large group of its members (Mau Whenua) who occupied the site and opposed its sale, wanting to uphold their cultural and spiritual connection to the land. Mau Whenua continue to oppose the sale of the land at Shelly Bay and should be included by the council in all decisions taken about its future.</p>	<p>Disallow / Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.</p>	<p>This point will be addressed in hearing Stream 3.</p>	
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.2	General / Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>The current Operative District Plan allows for heights of 11 metres or less in the suburban centre area, and zero (buildings not expected at all) in Open Space B land.</p> <p>The Wellington Company—Taranaki Whānui development at Shelly Bay was enabled by the High Court through the HASHA – (“Special Housing Areas”) agreement with intensive scale and impact on the District Plan saying that the default height limits in all SHAs anywhere were 27 metres. We believe that the legislation was completely mis-interpreted. We understand that the granting of this modification in accordance with Taranaki Whānui’s request would mean that any agreed development would for the life of the District Plan as of right be enabled up to 27 metres.</p> <p>A height limit of 27 metres is, in this context, completely inappropriate and antithetical to Open Space values. In addition, the height limit of 27 metres should not be viewed in isolation. Buildings up to a height of 27 metres will have a corresponding increase in local traffic, use of infrastructure and amenities, such that significant investment would be required in relation to the infrastructure before such buildings could be supported. The feasibility of undertaking such upgrades should be considered before any changes to the height limits are made.</p>	<p>Disallow</p>	<p>This point will be addressed in hearing Stream 3.</p>	
Mary Varnham and Paul O’Regan	FS40.3	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold its holdings at Shelly Bay and are no longer, as claimed, ‘significant landowners’. Their possible ownership interest in the peninsula as a whole through Right of First Refusal is confined to the Mt Crawford site as the adjacent 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been designated reserve by the government (the current landowner) and WCC since 2011.</p> <p>The local community, despite its active interest in and use of the bay, was shut out of all consultation during the resource consent process. It is critical that it be involved in all future decision making.</p> <p>The current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land is supported not only by the local community but by the wider Wellington public, as evidenced in the independent poll conducted for the group Buy Back the Bay by Research NZ, which showed that 78% of Wellingtonians want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park, which would also include the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula set aside by the government as a reserve in 2011.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have viewed Shelly Bay as a strictly commercial proposition and disavowed any cultural, historical and spiritual connection to the site. A substantial proportion of the iwi (mau whenua) have opposed and continue to oppose the sale of the site, and should be included by the council in all democratic decision making about the future of Shelly Bay.</p>	<p>Disallow</p>	<p>This point will be addressed in hearing Stream 3.</p>	

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.38	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.  Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:  "1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.  2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."  Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.	Disallow	This point will be addressed in hearing Stream 3.	
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Council Officers' recommendations June 2021 for Mount Victoria	Supports the Council Officers' recommendations June 2021 for Mount Victoria	See Character section of report and appendix.	
Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	FS91.54	Other / Other / Other	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted.  [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow / Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.	See Character section of report and appendix.	
Grace Ridley-Smith	390.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Council Officers' recommendations June 2021 for other old suburbs (such as Thorndon and Mount Cook etc.).	Supports the Council Officers' recommendations June 2021 for other old suburbs (such as Thorndon and Mount Cook etc.).	See Character section of report and appendix.	
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.5	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that Wellingtonians will relish the challenge of working together. Some suburbs such as Newtown are proactively taking a lead in rethinking their localities. Such initiatives create a sense of community, enhance democracy and deliver change in ways that build on community strengths.  Seeks that participatory design projects, coupled with clear housing targets, so communities are involved in welcoming new people. Imposing arbitrary change when better options exist simply fosters local resentment.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to be amended to make greater provision for limited notification (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours.	Reject	No
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	FS123.33	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow / Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.	Reject	No
Johnsonville Community Association	429.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that since Johnsonville residential area was zoned as Medium Density that many non-compliant and substandard multi-unit developments have been built.  Considers that if a review was done of this area that it would be found that District Plan Change 72 did not achieve its promised levels of high quality, high density housing.  [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that WCC complete an independent review of the MDRAs to determine if the objectives in DPC72 have been met and confirm the WCC has successfully permitted "Density Done Well" developments. This review should provide a clear list of Do's and Don'ts for future housing development within the city.	Reject	No
Johnsonville Community Association	429.6	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that because the Wellington RLTP says that decisions around intensification around Rapid Transit stops will be considered during the District Planning process, and the PDP does not have a definition of Rapid Transit, the classification of Johnsonville line or any other transit as Rapid Transit is not supported by the Wellington RLTP.	Seeks that WCC release the criteria used to determine which public transport stops are rapid transit stops and/or "commercial centres and with good public transport accessibility" deemed suitable for a MDRZ.	Addressed Report 1A	No
Johnsonville Community Association	429.12	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Submitter is concerned at the lack of supporting information in justifying these major changes in PDP urban planning rules for Johnsonville.	Seeks that further information be released on the justification of both the rapid transit stop walking catchment MDRZs and the metropolitan walking catchment MDRZ.	Addressed in Report 1A	No
Newtown Residents' Association	440.2	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the Planning for Residential Amenity, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Planning for Residential Amenity, Boffa Miskell Report.	Accept	No
Kay Larsen	447.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that it seems impossible to imagine allowing developers to demolish existing houses without public notification so that the local community can work together to improve the neighbourhood.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	No decision requested	No
Dale Mary McTavish	448.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Opposes recent examples of infill housing.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	No decision requested	No

General Residential

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Catharine Underwood	481.12	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the 'We Are Newtown housing/dwelling plan/proposal by the residents for the residents' should be recognised by Councillors and be considered as the blue print for Newtown. Council officers have rejected the residents' plan as it was different to the residents wants. Though it achieved exactly the same outcome regarding the number of dwellings.	Seek that the 'We Are Newtown housing/dwelling plan/proposal by the residents for the residents' be recognised and considered as the proposed district plan provisions for Newtown.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.242	General/ Other/ Other / Other	Oppose	Considers that this matter goes beyond the scope of the District Plan controls.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that there are too many shortcuts where the edges often have no obvious exits (because of high and solid property boundaries) and there is no surveillance.	Seeks that shortcuts have obvious exits and do not have high and solid property boundaries.  [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part	No

**Submissions identified in wrap up hearing s42A and considered in Report 2A**

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Recommendation	Changes to PDP? Y/N
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	<p>Considers that it is not appropriate that the Council’s discretion is restricted to all matters in the Design Guide. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications. Rather than being formally incorporated into the District Plan, the design guides should be reference documents that sit outside the District Plan. Incorporating the design guides into the district plan elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance.</p>	Seeks that all direct references to the design guides in the Proposed District Plan provisions are deleted and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are being sought.	Reject	no
Victoria University of Wellington Students’ Association	123.3	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	Considers that climate resilience should require a holistic approach.	Seeks that housing and city areas should have a people-centred design.	Reject	no

Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its comments on boundary setbacks: 'it is common for a side, rear or front boundary set back to provide space between buildings. Set-backs can be used to provide a degree of privacy separation between adjoining buildings, allow site access/circulation or to address scale/dominance of buildings in relation to one another. Set backs in the order of 1-3m are common'.	Not specified.	Accept	no
Jonathan Markwick	490.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>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.</p> <p>Students and staff have extremely high rents with a restricted housing supply in Kelburn.</p>	Amend the mapping to allow six storey high density residential buildings in all of Kelburn (with a viewshaft protection from the top of the cable car).	Reject	no
Generation Zero	FS54.3	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Support and submit: Enable 6 stories in more of Kelburn. Kelburn is the site of a major regional employment hub and currently has very low development capacity and correspondingly higher rents, house prices and lower rental quality than the rest of the city.	Allow / Seeks the adoption of 6 storey zoning across more of Kelburn.	Reject	no



Guy Marriage	407.2	Part 3 General / Part 3 General / Part 3 General	Amend	<p>Considers that the shift in density and a residential zone level and potential for 3x3 on a single site calls for the need to have a design review, certainly if a 3x3 is proposed, and any development within the inner city as this will have a significant impact on the cities character. Without clear incentives for high quality design outcomes we simply risk creating a dumbed down mediocre city. A mandatory Design Panel Review will encourage high quality design outcomes.</p>	<p>Seeks the addition of a mandatory Design Review Panel for all inner-city developments, 3x3 developments in the medium density residential zone, mixed use developments and centres where developments are over 3 levels.</p>	Reject	no
Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.14	Part 3 General / Part 3 General / Part 3 General	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellingtonians will relish the challenge of working together. Some suburbs such as Newtown are proactively taking a lead in rethinking their localities. Such initiatives create a sense of community, enhance democracy and deliver change in ways that build on community strengths.</p> <p>Seeks that participatory design projects, coupled with clear housing targets, so communities are involved in welcoming new people. Imposing arbitrary change when better options exist simply fosters local resentment.</p>	<p>Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to be amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect of urban design so as to ensure that quality in design at a local level can be considered for the majority of developments, and that this process is tied to community-level design guides as they are developed.</p>	Reject	no

<p>Willis Bond and Company Limited</p>	<p>416.94</p>	<p>Commercial and mixed use Zones / Local Centre Zone / General LCZ</p>	<p>Amend</p>	<p>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].</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Accept</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities</p>	<p>391.743</p>	<p>Development Area / Development Area Kilbirnie Bus Barns / General DEV1</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Seeks amendments to the rules to make all necessary consequential changes in response to the rezoning of those parcels which are identified for Medium Density Residential Zone to High Density Residential Zone. This rezoning is sought as considers the sites adjoin the metropolitan centres and thereby the adjoining zoning should appropriately be High Density Residential Zone. Considers this zone would also align in the outcomes sought in the overarching submission.</p>	<p>Seeks consequential amendments for all rules to reflect the High Density Residential Development rules.</p>	<p>Accept in part</p>	<p>no</p>

Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.744	Development Area / Development Area Kilbirnie Bus Barns / General DEV1	Amend	Seeks amendments to the rules to make all necessary consequential changes in response to the rezoning of those parcels which are identified for Medium Density Residential Zone to High Density Residential Zone. This rezoning is sought as considers the sites adjoin the metropolitan centres and thereby the adjoining zoning should appropriately be High Density Residential Zone. Considers this zone would also align in the outcomes sought in the overarching submission.	Seeks consequential amendments for all rules to reflect the High Density Residential Development rules.	Accept in part	No
--	---------	---	-------	---	---	----------------	----