Wellington City Proposed District Plan
Report 5C
Three Waters
Subdivision
Earthworks

Appendix 2B
Recommended Responses to Submissions and Further Submissions
Subdivision

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Tyers Stream Group	221.66	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	Considers that the RMA definition of river applies to streams. There are also waterways in Wellington with an annual flow bed width that is more than 3m wide, including Tyers Stream downstream from approximately the junction of Delhi and Karachi Crescents. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that appropriate esplanade provision be made along the margins of Tyers Stream, and other waterways, whenever subdivision occurs (as is required by the RMA) to create better linkages and facilitate more liveable spaces and lower energy/runoff intensity use of areas,	Accept in part	No
Waka Kotahi	370.189	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	Subdivision close to the state highway corridor should be at least restricted discretionary, and (as noted elsewhere), if there is a blanket distance from the state highway, it should be 100m. At subdivision stage there can be better options available to manage noise exposure rather than leaving it to treat individual houses, which does not protect outdoor amenity and can constrain residents to having to use mechanical ventilation.	Seeks to amend to require consent (at least restricted discretionary) for subdivision within 100m of a state highway.	Reject	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.55	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Support	Supports the relief sought and seeks further amendment to include the rail corridor within this provision. If subdivision within 100m of the rail corridor had a RDIS activity status, noise and vibration management options could be considered for a whole development as opposed to on individual properties. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Amend / Adopt amendment sought and include rail corridor within provision	Reject	No
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.27	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Stride considers that it would be unnecessary and inappropriate to apply a Restricted Discretionary activity status for all subdivision with 100m of a state highway. This blanket rule lacks nuance and may impose an unreasonable burden on subdivision, and other controls are more appropriate to manage any effects of the subdivision on the state highway.	Disallow	Accept	No
Investore Property Limited	FS108.27	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Investore considers that it would be unnecessary and inappropriate to apply a Restricted Discretionary activity status for all subdivision with 100m of a state highway. This blanket rule lacks nuance and may impose an unreasonable burden on subdivision, and other controls are more appropriate to manage any effects of the subdivision on the state highway.	Disallow	Accept	No
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.83	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford. Submitter supports the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as landscapes that have cultural, historical, spiritual and traditional significance to Taranaki Whānui, the identification and protection of environmental overlays in previously developed areas is of concern to Taranaki Whānui. Concerns there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over their ancestral lands.	Seeks that the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford is removed; specifically at Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST.	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A

Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.12	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	It is clear Taranaki Whānui want all restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear based on the submission exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned. Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan, both the Corrections and Defence Land have not in the past contested this zoning and the Proposed District Plan keeps Watts Peninsula as open Space, the Ridgelines and Hilltops add to significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) it has a Special Amenity Landscape which is used by the community and tourists to the enjoyment of being close to a city but with a natural environment. Taranaki Whānui are seeking to amend the zoning in this area to Medium Density Residential or to a Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone, without any public engagement. Such changes would have a significant impact on the local community and should not be undertaken without wider consultation and engagement in order to ensure that proposed changes do not have a detrimental effect. As noted above, it is of concern to the businesses, community (ratepayers) of Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula and the wider public that the rezoning applied for by Taranaki Whanui (currently open space) to develop a papakāinga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula. Inferred reference to submission 389.83].	Disallow	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.13	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford." It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as: • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.	Disallow	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.30	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land." Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park. Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."	Disallow	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.49	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	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 will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lance Lones	FS81.15	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of pīwakawaka and tūī, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings. To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again. Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke. The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Andy Foster	FS86.18	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	The submission from Taranaki Whanui if accepted would remove all protections, many of them long standing and uncontested for decades, from Te Motu Kairangi / Watts Peninsula and make community involvement much less likely, and limit the need for community involvement. On these basis the submitter opposes Taranaki Whānui's submission. Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan. It has been Open Space B for at least the last 30 years, and nobody has ever contested this. That includes both the Corrections and Defence Land. The Proposed District Plan keeps Watts as Open Space and within the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay. It also adds Significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) and a Special Amenity Landscape (because of its high level of landscape importance) All of these are based on good evidence. Taranaki Whanui want all of those restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned. Taranaki Whānui's request to remove the Open Space zoning which has been in place, uncontested by the owners, for at least 30 years. The current Open Space B zoning does not anticipate any built development and therefore there is no legal or reasonable expectation that there should be any development here. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.83]	Disallow	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.84	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	Considers that overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands.	Seeks that any other relief to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi.	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.23	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve focused on protecting iwi and military history sites and retaining the value of the natural landscape of the area. Supports the establishment of such a reserve and would like to see it become part of the National Heritage Park proposed by the Buy Back the Bay group. The zoning and overlays of the Proposed District Plan must be kept if the reserve/heritage park is to be a viable option. Taranaki Whānui's requests would remove many protections that have been longstanding and unopposed for decades, which must surely not occur without extensive community engagement. Watts Peninsula, withs its ridges and hill lines visible from all over Wellington, should remain undeveloped, which might very well not be the case if the land is rezoned.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.23	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	From 2011 the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve, to incorporate and protect iwi (as well as military) sites and history. Submitter supports this as an appropriate and visionary plan for the peninsula. Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park. Submitter supports a conservancy model for development and management of this park, to include iwi, government, council, the local community, and organisations such as Forest and Bird and Predator Free Miramar. Disallow all proposals by Taranaki Whanui to remove the proposed zoning and overlays. These provisions are vital to protect the natural values, history and landscape of Watts Peninsula, a prominent feature of Te Whanganui-a-Tara. Supports retaining all provisions in the proposed district plan for Open Space B, Ridgelines and Hilltops, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape. We note the magnificent work done by Predator Free Miramar. Protecting and enhancing the huge gains in bringing back birdlife made should be a primary consideration. We also believe the peninsula should see extensive planting and regeneration of native forest.	Disallow	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.14	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford." It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as: • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites a nd Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and L andscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.	Disallow	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.31	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land." Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park. Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."	Disallow	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.50	Part 2 /Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	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 will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Lance Lones	FS81.16	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of pīwakawaka and tūī, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings. To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again. Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke. The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.85	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford. Submitter supports the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as landscapes that have cultural, historical, spiritual and traditional significance to Taranaki Whānui, the identification and protection of environmental overlays in previously developed areas is of concern to Taranaki Whānui. Concerns there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over their ancestral lands.	Seeks that the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford is removed; specifically at Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST.	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.13	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	It is clear Taranaki Whānui want all restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear based on the submission exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned. Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan, both the Corrections and Defence Land have not in the past contested this zoning and the Proposed District Plan keeps Watts Peninsula as open Space, the Ridgelines and Hilltops add to significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) it has a Special Amenity Landscape which is used by the community and tourists to the enjoyment of being close to a city but with a natural environment. Taranaki Whānui are seeking to amend the zoning in this area to Medium Density Residential or to a Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone, without any public engagement. Such changes would have a significant impact on the local community and should not be undertaken without wider consultation and engagement in order to ensure that proposed changes do not have a detrimental effect. As noted above, it is of concern to the businesses, community (ratepayers) of Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula and the wider public that the rezoning applied for by Taranaki Whanui (currently open space) to develop a papakāinga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula. [Inferred reference to submission 389.85].	Disallow	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.15	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford." It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as: • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites a nd Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.	Disallow	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.32	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land." Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park. Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."	Disallow	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.51	Part 2 /Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	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 will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Lance Lones	FS81.17	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of pīwakawaka and tūī, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings. To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again. Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke. The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Andy Foster	FS86.19	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	The submission from Taranaki Whanui if accepted would remove all protections, many of them long standing and uncontested for decades, from Te Motu Kairangi / Watts Peninsula and make community involvement much less likely, and limit the need for community involvement. On these basis the submitter opposes Taranaki Whānui's submission. Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan. It has been Open Space B for at least the last 30 years, and nobody has ever contested this. That includes both the Corrections and Defence Land. The Proposed District Plan keeps Watts as Open Space and within the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay. It also adds Significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) and a Special Amenity Landscape (because of its high level of landscape importance) All of these are based on good evidence. Taranaki Whanui want all of those restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned. Taranaki Whānui's request to remove the Open Space zoning which has been in place, uncontested by the owners, for at least 30 years. The current Open Space B zoning does not anticipate any built development and therefore there is no legal or reasonable expectation that there should be any development here. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.85]	Disallow	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.86	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	Considers that overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands.	Seeks that any other relief to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi.	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.24	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve focused on protecting iwi and military history sites and retaining the value of the natural landscape of the area. Supports the establishment of such a reserve and would like to see it become part of the National Heritage Park proposed by the Buy Back the Bay group. The zoning and overlays of the Proposed District Plan must be kept if the reserve/heritage park is to be a viable option. Taranaki Whānui's requests would remove many protections that have been longstanding and unopposed for decades, which must surely not occur without extensive community engagement. Watts Peninsula, withs its ridges and hill lines visible from all over Wellington, should remain undeveloped, which might very well not be the case if the land is rezoned.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.24	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	From 2011 the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve, to incorporate and protect iwi (as well as military) sites and history. Submitter supports this as an appropriate and visionary plan for the peninsula. Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park. Submitter supports a conservancy model for development and management of this park, to include iwi, government, council, the local community, and organisations such as Forest and Bird and Predator Free Miramar. Disallow all proposals by Taranaki Whanui to remove the proposed zoning and overlays. These provisions are vital to protect the natural values, history and landscape of Watts Peninsula, a prominent feature of Te Whanganui-a-Tara. Supports retaining all provisions in the proposed district plan for Open Space B, Ridgelines and Hilltops, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape. We note the magnificent work done by Predator Free Miramar. Protecting and enhancing the huge gains in bringing back birdlife made should be a primary consideration. We also believe the peninsula should see extensive planting and regeneration of native forest.	Disallow	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.16	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford." It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as: • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites a nd Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.	Disallow	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.33	Part 2 / General District wide Matters / Coastal Environment / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land." Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park. Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks. This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."	Disallow	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.52	Part 2 /Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	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 will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Lance Lones	FS81.18	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of pīwakawaka and tūī, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings. To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again. Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke. The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.	This will be addressed in the Open Space and Recreation hearing	N/A
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.255	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the subdivision chapter is amended to align with the decisions requested in submission points found in paragraph 4.68.1 to 4.68.3 of the original submission. [Refer to paragraphs 4.68.1 to 4.68.3 of the original submission]	Accept in part	No
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.68	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Support	Support WIAL's submission for the reasons set out in WIAL's submission.	Allow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.256	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the subdivision chapter is amended to discourage intensification of noise-sensitive activities through subdivision within the Air Noise Boundary or Outer Air Noise Overlay.	Accept in part	Yes
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.69	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Support	Support WIAL's submission for the reasons set out in WIAL's submission.	Allow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.257	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	A number of the objectives and policies restrict or limit subdivision activities in certain overlays. None of these provisions however reflect the ANB or 60dB Ldn Boundary for the Airport.	Seeks that objectives and policies in the subdivision are amended to ensure that Air Noise Boundary and the Outer Air Noise Overlay is sufficient to manage aircraft noise and reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part	Yes
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.70	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Support	Support WIAL's submission for the reasons set out in WIAL's submission.	Allow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.258	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	A number of the objectives and policies restrict or limit subdivision activities in certain overlays. None of these provisions however reflect the ANB or 60dB Ldn Boundary for the Airport.	Seeks that subdivision activities are restricted within the 60dB Ldn Boundary.	Accept in part	No
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.71	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Support	Support WIAL's submission for the reasons set out in WIAL's submission.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.259	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the subdivision chapter is amended to simplify rules and remove repetition.	Accept in part.	Yes
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.72	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Support	Support WIAL's submission for the reasons set out in WIAL's submission.	Allow	Accept in part.	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.260	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that further guidance is added with regards to where it is necessary for building platforms to be identified as a part of subdivision activity.	Reject	No
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.73	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Support	Support WIAL's submission for the reasons set out in WIAL's submission.	Allow	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.261	Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that there is no requirement for building platforms to be identified within the Airport Zone.	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.95	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Oppose in part	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Seeks to delete matter of control / discretion below from the rules listed: ~~Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary~~ Relevant rules: SUB-R1.1.7 SUB-R2.2.4 SUB-R3.2.5 SUB-R3.3.8 SUB-R4.1.3 SUB-R4.2.4 SUB-R5.1.3 SUB-R5.2.7 SUB-R5.3.4 SUB-R17.1.3 SUB-R17.2.3 SUB-R18.1.1c SUB-R19.1.3 SUB-R22.1.3 SUB-R23.1.3 SUB-R26.1.3	Accept	Yes
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	FS116.4	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Support	SSNZ Wellington agree that the consideration of "consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' provides a wide discretion and so is not appropriate for rules with controlled and discretionary restricted activity status.	Allow	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.96	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Seeks to delete matter of control / discretion below from the rules listed: ~~Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary~~ Relevant rules: SUB-R1.1.7 SUB-R2.2.4 SUB-R3.2.5 SUB-R3.3.8 SUB-R4.1.3 SUB-R4.2.4 SUB-R5.1.3 SUB-R5.2.7 SUB-R5.3.4 SUB-R17.1.3 SUB-R17.2.3 SUB-R18.1.1c SUB-R19.1.3 SUB-R22.1.3 SUB-R23.1.3 SUB-R26.1.3	Accept	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.166	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers that in order to assist with plan interpretation and application, reference to the National Grid as a qualifying matter within the introductory/plan relationship text of the subdivision chapter of the PDP should be included.	Amend the introduction to the Subdivision Chapter as follows: Other relevant District Plan provisions It is important to note that in addition to the provisions in this chapter, subdivision must comply with all applicable rules and standards for qualifying matter areas and a number of other Part 2: District-Wide chapters also contain provisions that may be relevant, including: … - Infrastructure - the subdivision chapter includes rules to implement objectives and policies in the Infrastructure Chapter where certain types of subdivision are in close proximity to some network utilities. The National Grid is a qualifying matter with its rules to be applied. … Resource consent may therefore be required under rules in this chapter as well as other chapters. Unless specifically stated in a rule or in this chapter, resource consent is required under each relevant rule. The steps to determine the status of an activity are set out in the General Approach chapter.	Reject	No
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.167	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Support	Considers the introductory text to the Subdivision Chapter provides guidance as to the applicability of the rule and policy provisions. Supports this guidance, in particular the reference that the area specific and topic specific provisions apply. A minor amendment is sought to amend the reference 'topic specific' to 'district wide' as it is considered the term 'topic specific' is not otherwise used in the plan and therefore it may be unclear to plan users to which provisions the term applies.	Retain the Introductory text to the Subdivision Chapter, subject to a minor amendment.	Accept	Yes
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.168	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers the introductory text to the Subdivision Chapter provides guidance as to the applicability of the rule and policy provisions. Supports this guidance, in particular the reference that the area specific and topic specific provisions apply. A minor amendment is sought to amend the reference 'topic specific' to 'district wide' as it is considered the term 'topic specific' is not otherwise used in the plan and therefore it may be unclear to plan users to which provisions the term applies.	Amend the introductory text to the Subdivision Chapter as follows: … Rule SUB-R1 relates specifically to subdivision of land for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone and the High Density Residential Zone. Subdivisions under Rule SUB-R1 are not subject to Rules SUB-R2 – SUB-R5, but are subject to the area specific and topic-specific district wide rules where the land also contains a corresponding planning notation or overlay. …..	Accept	Yes
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.169	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Support	Supports guidance provided within the introduction to the PDP that clarifies for plan users that the objectives and policies relating to subdivision within the National Grid Yard are provided within the INF Chapter. Considers such direction is necessary given the PDP chapters separates the rules from the supporting policy framework.	Seeks to retain the text within the 'Other relevant District Plan provisions' section of the Introduction to the Subdivision chapter.	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.178	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers that in riparian margins landward of the coastal environment, the first step to assessing the potential effects of an activity (such as subdivision) on natural character requires determining the natural character rating, both at the site and area scales. Therefore, including a new policy to direct natural character ratings to be identified in riparian margins landward of the coastal environment will ensure that potential effects can be managed as part of the assessment of environmental effects in accordance with the natural character rating.	Seeks to include a new process policy as requested in the Natural Character chapter, for WCC to identify natural character ratings in riparian margins landward of the coastal environment and, in the interim, for WCC officers to work with applicants for resource consent to determine as to whether a natural character assessment is required as part of a resource consent process.	This submission point will be addressed in the NATC Hearing.	N/A
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.187	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Support in part	The Introduction to the Subdivision chapter is generally supported, but amendments are sought to clarify the effects of poorly designed subdivisions are related to vacant lot subdivisions where the land use activities have not been designed.	Retain the Introduction to the Subdivision chapter with amendments.	Accept in part	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.188	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers that the Introduction to the Subdivision chapter should be amended to clarify how the effects of poorly designed subdivisions are related to vacant lot subdivisions where the land use activities have not been designed. Further amendments are sought to clarify that the District Plan seeks to provide a more enabling framework for combined land use and subdivision resource consents. Further amendments are sought for clarity as it is considered that the explanation of the application of the objectives, policies and rules is confusing and does not provide further clarity, and that the objectives, policies and rules themselves should clearly describe how they apply.	Amend the Introduction to the Subdivision chapter as follows: … In addition to facilitating increased housing supply and choice, subdivision is related to the Council's aims for a more sustainable and resilient future for Wellington. For example, poorly designed vacant lot subdivisions can limit neighbourhood connectivity and cohesion, entailing also longer travel times, greater reliance on private vehicle transport and associated increases in greenhouse gas emissions. … Poorly-designed vacant lot subdivisions can also lead to greater energy consumption an associated costs for home heating, relative to designs that make better use of solar aspect another renewable energy opportunities. Objectives, policies, rules and standards included in the subdivision chapter seek to manage the effects of vacant lot subdivision. When subdivision and related land use activities are assessed concurrently, it enables a comprehensive understanding of the resulting pattern, scale and density of development. For this reason, the Council prefers combined subdivision and land use resource consent applications to be made wherever possible and therefore the District Plan provides a more enabling framework for combined subdivision and land use application. ~~However, it is understood that such an integrated approach is not always practicable or preferable for applicants, for a variety of reasons.~~ … Subdivisions commonly lead to in an increase in intensity of land use activity, and additional steps may need to be taken for vacant lot ~~at~~ subdivisions ~~stage~~ to ensure existing and future activities can be serviced for access, water supply, wastewater disposal, stormwater management, telecommunications and power supply. ….	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.189	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers that the Introduction to the Subdivision chapter should be amended to clarify the effects of poorly designed subdivisions are related to vacant lot subdivisions where the land use activities have not been designed. Further amendments are sought to clarify that the District Plan seeks to provide a more enabling framework for combined land use and subdivision resource consents. Further amendments are sought for clarity as it is considered that the explanation of the application of the objectives, policies and rules is confusing and does not provide further clarity, and that the objectives, policies and rules themselves should clearly describe how they apply.	Amend the Introduction to the Subdivision chapter as follows: … Subdivision is only permitted in limited circumstances. Under Section 223 of the RMA, a ~~requires that a~~ survey plan for such subdivisions may be submitted to Council for approval provided that a certificate of compliance has been obtained for the subdivision and that certificate has not lapsed. … ~~Rule SUB-R1 relates specifically to subdivision of land for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone and the High Density Residential Zone. Subdivisions under Rule SUB-R1 are not subject to Rules SUB-R2 – SUB-R5, but are subject to the area-specific and topic-specific rules where the land also contains a corresponding planning notation or overlay.~~ ~~With the exception of Rule SUB-R1, the general subdivision objectives, policies and rules apply to all subdivision proposals, including those that affect land subject to other planning map notations, areas, or overlays. To the extent relevant, this includes Objectives SUB-O1 and SUB-O2, Policies SUB-P1 – SUB-P8, and Rules SUB-R2 – SUB-R5.~~ ~~In addition to those general provisions, the area-specific and topic-specific policies and rules apply to subdivisions affecting land subject to the applicable planning notation or overlay. This includes Policies SUB-P9 – SUB-P26, and Rules SUB-R6 – SUB-R31.~~	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.190	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Support in part	Headings in the Subdivision chapter are partially supported and some additional headings are proposed.	Retain the Subdivision chapter with amendments.	Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.191	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers that the Subdivision chapter should be amended to have additional headings are added to the chapter to categorise the policies to help with plan legibility and usability.	Amend the Subdivision chapter to add new policy headings as follows: Historic Heritage and Cultural Values: SUB-P8 – SUB-P13 Natural Environment: SUB-P14 – SUB-P19 Coastal Environment: SUB-P20 – SUB-P24 Natural Hazards: SUB-P25 – SUB-P26	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.192	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Support in part	The introduction of notification preclusion statement (for both public and limited notification) for restricted discretionary activities is supported. It is sought that this is applied to all restricted discretionary activities.	Retain the Introduction to the Subdivision chapter as notified, with chapter subject to amendments.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.57	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Considers it necessary to be notified of infrastructure activities adjacent to the rail corridor to ensure KiwiRail has the opportunity to be included in the planning assessment process. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.193	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers that all rules in the Subdivision chapter should have a notification preclusion statement (for both public and limited notification) for restricted discretionary activities. The technical nature of these breaches requires technical and/or engineering assessments, and public participation by way of limited or public notification will unlikely add anything to the consideration of the effects of these breaches. Particularly, the notification statuses for SUB-R1 generally relate to the land use activity and associated standards, and the subdivision itself is not generating additional effects that should trigger notification.	Amend all Rules in the Subdivision chapter to include a notification preclusion statement for activities under Restricted Discretionary as follows: Notification: Applications under this rule are precluded from being publicly or limited notified in accordance with section 95A or section 95B of the RMA.	Reject	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.58	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Oppose	Considers it necessary to be notified of infrastructure activities adjacent to the rail corridor to ensure KiwiRail has the opportunity to be included in the planning assessment process. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.136	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Oppose	Blanket approach to non-notification of subdivision is too blunt an approach and inconsistent with the policy of the RMA. There is insufficient justification to depart from the usual notification tests.	Disallow	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.194	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Oppose in part	Opposes the matter of control and matter of discretion to 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instructed necessary' with all controlled and restricted discretion activities are opposed. An amendment is sought for all Rules in the Subdivision chapter.	Opposes the matter of control and matter of discretion to 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instructed necessary' with all controlled and restricted discretion activities and requests amendments.	Accept	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.195	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers that all Rules in the Subdivision chapter should be amended to remove matters of discretion for activities with controlled and restricted discretionary status referring to 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instructed necessary'. This should not be a determining matter for discretion when granting consent. Anticipated development is provided for within the framework of the underlying zone and relevant district plan provisions, and covenants and consent notices are tools that are currently provided for when necessary and appropriate under current legislation. Deletion is sought in all rules.	Amend all Rules in the Subdivision chapter to remove reference of "Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary".	Accept	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.196	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Oppose in part	The inclusion of design guides as a statutory document and matter of discretion with the Subdivision chapter Rules is opposed. Design guides should act as a tool to give effect to the outcomes in the objectives and policies of the chapter. Deletion is sought in all rules.	Opposes all references to design guides throughout all rules in the plan.	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.3	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Oppose	The Design guides provide a useful and informative guide to design of subdivision and development and should be retained.	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Reject	No
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.24	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Disallow / Seeks that the improved design guides in the Proposed District Plan as notified are retained.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.197	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers that all Rules in the Subdivision chapter should be amended to remove Design Guides. Design guides should act as a tool to give effect to the outcomes in the objectives and policies of the chapter and should not be considered as statutory documents in matters of discretion. Deletion is sought in all rules.	Amend all Rules in the Subdivision chapter to remove references of Design Guides.	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.4	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Oppose	The Design guides provide a useful and informative guide to design of subdivision and development and should be retained.	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.262	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / General SUB	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to other provisions within the subdivision chapter to remove the complex and duplicating consenting requirements for activities withing the Airport Zone. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the subdivision chapter is amended to delete subdivision methods other than SUB-R4 insofar as they relate to infrastructure and/or provide clarification that the other provisions are not applicable to infrastructure.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Trelissick Park Group	168.17	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Amend	Considers that subdivision should not be allowed in significant natural areas.	Add a new provision to the Subdivision chapter to prevent subdivision in significant natural areas. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.190	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Amend	The Submitter seeks an additional standard which subdivision activities shall be assessed against when located within specified distances of the state highway network. Notes that it is widely accepted nationally and internationally that noise from transport networks have the potential to cause adverse health and amenity effects on people living nearby. That potential has been documented by authoritative bodies such as the World Health Organisation (WHO), including the Publication Environmental Noise Guidelines for the European region in October 2018 (WHO Europe Guidelines). State highways pass through both urban and rural areas throughout the Wellington City District and most have sufficient traffic volumes to generate sound above WHO Europe Guideline levels, indicating there will be impacts on human health and amenity where noise sensitive activities locate nearby. Applying the metric setback approach is a moderately efficient and effective method of managing noise effects on human health when compared to alternatives such as do nothing, modelling a setback, or creating a 'no build' yard zone. In the future, the submitter may seek a change to this standard to reflect modelling data which is a highly efficient and effective method of management. [See original submission for further details]	Add a new Standard to the Subdivision chapter as follows: SUB-SX Subdivision resulting in the creation of new sites 100m of a State Highway (measured from the nearest painted edge of the carriageway). Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. The potential adverse effects of noise generated from the road network. 2. The potential adverse effects of site development on the efficient use and operation of the state highway network and the suitability of any mitigation measures relating to noise and vibration to enable the continued operation of the network. 3. Whether any consultation with Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency has occurred and the outcome of that consultation. 4. Whether a consent notice with regard to reverse sensitivity effects on the State Highway network is proposed. 5. Whether any proposed building platform or development should be restricted to parts of the site. 6. Whether there are any special topographical features or ground conditions which may mitigate effects on the operation of the State Highway network.	Reject	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.56	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / General point on Subdivision	Support	Supports the relief sought and seeks further amendment to include the rail corridor within this provision. If subdivision within 100m of the rail corridor had a RDIS activity status, noise and vibration management options could be considered for a whole development as opposed to on individual properties. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Amend / Adopt amendment sought and include rail corridor within provision	Accept in part	Yes
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.28	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Oppose	Stride is opposed to applying additional restrictions within 100m of a state highway and considers that this amendment seeks to unfairly impose the costs of mitigating state highway noise on private landowners. As noted above, this blanket rule lacks nuance and may impose an unreasonable burden on subdivision, and other controls are more appropriate to manage any effects of the subdivision on the state highway.	Disallow	Reject	No
Investore Property Limited	FS108.28	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Oppose	Investore is opposed to applying additional restrictions within 100m of a state highway and considers that this amendment seeks to unfairly impose the costs of mitigating state highway noise on private landowners. As noted above, this blanket rule lacks nuance and may impose an unreasonable burden on subdivision, and other controls are more appropriate to manage any effects of the subdivision on the state highway.	Disallow	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.198	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Amend	Considers that the Subdivision chapter should have an additional objective added to the subdivision chapter which speaks directly to the outcomes sought for subdivision within or on land identified as having historical values, natural environmental values and coastal values. This addition is sought to set a clear overarching objective to the policies concerned with these environments which are more sensitive to change.	Add a new Objective to the Subdivision chapter as follows: SUB-O[number] Subdivision is managed in areas with identified historical values, natural environmental and coastal values, where subdivision can have adverse effects on the values that the District Plan seeks to manage or protect.	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.5	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Support	The new objective suggested by the submitter has merit, and serves to support the subsequent policies and rules.	Allow	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.263	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Amend	Considers that a new policy is required to address subdivision within the Air Noise Boundary and 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary.	Add a new policy to SUB chapter as follows: SUB-P27 Subdivision of land affected by the Air Noise Boundary or 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary Avoid subdivision within the Air Noise Boundary or 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary where the potential future permitted density of noise sensitive activities will give rise to adverse reverse sensitivity effects on Wellington International Airport.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.122	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed policy which would unnecessarily constrain urban development within areas that would be suitable for high density development and where adverse effects can be managed through acoustic insulation and ventilation requirements.	Disallow	Reject	No
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.74	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Support	Support WIAL's submission for the reasons set out in WIAL's submission.	Allow	Accept	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.57	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Support	Considers that the policy from the operative district plan should be added [see original submission for full reasons]	Add a new policy as follows: *"Protect the heritage values of listed buildings, objects, areas and scheduled archaeological sites by ensuring that the effects of subdivision and development on the same site as any listed building or object are avoided, remedied and mitigated"*	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.6	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / New SUB	Support	New policy addressing the avoidance of adverse effects of subdivision on heritage places. While policies SUB-P10, SUB-P11, and SUB-P12 address subdivision of land containing historic heritage features, these policies provide for subdivision, having regard to certain relevant matters. The addition of a policy for avoiding or mitigating adverse effects has merit.	Allow	No decision specified	No
John Tiley	142.13	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Amend	Considers that the focus of SUB-O1 is on efficient development but is silent on preservation of landscape amenity values. The objective is unbalanced should be rewritten.	Seeks that SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) is rewritten to provide greater balance between efficient development and the preservation of landscape amenity values. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Churton Park Community Association	189.13	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Amend	Considers that the focus of SUB-O1 is on efficient development but is silent on preservation of landscape amenity values. The objective is unbalanced should be rewritten.	Seeks that SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) is rewritten to provide greater balance between efficient development and the preservation of landscape amenity values. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.105	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Support	Supports the objective as it promotes adequate servicing of new subdivisions, including for water supply.	Retain SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) as notified.	Reject	No
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.20	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Amend	Considers that Marshall's Ridge should be given protection through the strengthening of the objective.	Amend SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) to give further protection to Marshall's Ridge and other ridgelines within the area.	Accept	No
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.50	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Not specified	Submitter is 'neutral' on provision. SUB-O1 is supported in that the electricity distribution network is clearly identified as being associated with efficient development. However, the need for a separate definition for development infrastructure is still reflected in SUB-01. It is because of this concern that position remains neutral to the objective as currently worded.	Not specified.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.191	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Support in part	Supports with amendment.	Supports SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) with amendment.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.192	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Amend	Considers an additional outcome sought for subdivision activities to ensure that development considers land use and transport in an integrated manner throughout both the urban and rural areas as all development should consider the connections to the movement of people.	Amend Objective SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) as follows: … 6. The provision of electricity connections to the legal boundary or each allotment; and 7. Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary.; and 8. Any potential adverse effects of site development on the efficient use and operation of the roading and state highway network.	Accept	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.59	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / SUB-O1	Support	Supports the additional clause 8 but seeks that this matter is broadened to also consider potential adverse effects on the efficient use and operation of the rail network as sought in our primary submission. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Amend / Adopt amendment sought and include rail corridor within provision	Accept in part	No
LIVE WELLington	FS96.91	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Oppose	More enabling than MDRS requirements without adequate justification.	Disallow	Reject	No
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.29	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Oppose	Stride is opposed to this requested amendment as it is inappropriately broad and may be interpreted to require all subdivision to consider potential effects on the state highway network.	Disallow	Accept	No
Investore Property Limited	FS108.29	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Oppose	Investore is opposed to this requested amendment as it is inappropriately broad and may be interpreted to require all subdivision to consider potential effects on the state highway network.	Disallow	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.162	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Support	This objective is in line with the overall strategic objectives of the plan, spatial plan and proposed Regional Policy Statement.	Retain SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.199	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Support in part	Objective SUB-O1 is generally supported, but minor amendments are sought to recognise that the zone purpose, form and function along with amenity values will change overtime.	Retain Objective SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) with amendment.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.200	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Amend	Considers that Objective SUB-O1 should be amended to recognise that the zone purpose, form and function along with amenity values will change overtime. This objective should align with Policy-5 that recognises the scale and intensity anticipated for the underlying zone.	Amend Objective SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) as follows: Subdivision achieves an efficient development pattern that: 1. Maintains or enhances Wellington's compact urban form; 2. Is compatible with the nature, scale and intensity anticipated for the underlying zone ~~and local context~~; 3. Enables flexibility, innovation and choice for ~~appropriate~~ future development and use of resulting land or buildings; and 4. Is supported by development infrastructure and additional infrastructure for existing and anticipated future activities.	Accept	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.137	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Oppose	Consider local context is an important consideration for a consent authority. Local context ties in with the RMA's purpose of sustainable development.	Disallow	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.264	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Oppose in part	Opposes SUB-O1. [see paragraph 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for full reason]	Opposes SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) and seeks amendment.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.265	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Amend	Opposes SUB-O1. [see paragraph 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) as follows: … 5. Avoids development that is incompatible with regionally significant infrastructure.	Accept	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.60	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Support	Supports amendment to this policy to ensure regionally significant infrastructure is protected. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.123	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment which would constrain urban development. Furthermore, the amendment results in a lack of clarity for Plan users to understand what development may be incompatible.	Disallow	Accept	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.97	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Amend	Considers that subdivision, and associated land use development that subdivision enables, can compromise public safety and the safe operation of the rail network if inappropriately designed. KiwiRail seek amendment to SUB-O1 to recognise the value of the transport network, and the need to maintain the safety and efficiency of this network.	Amend SUB-O1 (Efficient pattern of development) as follows: Subdivision achieves an efficient development pattern that: 1 Maintains or enhances Wellington's compact urban form; 2. Is compatible with the zone purpose, local context and associated amenity values; 3 Enables appropriate future development and use of resulting land or buildings; and 4 Is supported by development infrastructure and additional infrastructure for existing and anticipated future activities. 5. Maintains the safety and efficiency of the transport network.	Accept	No
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.19	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Oppose	Stride is opposed to the insertion of reference to 'maintains the safety and efficiency of the transport network'.	Disallow	Accept	No
Investore Property Limited	FS108.19	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Oppose	Investore is opposed to the insertion of reference to 'maintains the safety and efficiency of the transport network'.	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.163	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O2	Support	This objective recognises the importance of residents being able to access coastal and freshwater margins, and that in many areas such access doesn't exist, or is difficult.	Retain SUB-O2 (Esplanades) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.256	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P1	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P1 (Recognising and providing for subdivision) as notified.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.164	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P1	Support	SUB-S1 is supported as it helps give effect to the Subdivision objectives.	Retain SUB-P1 (Recognising and providing for subdivision) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.201	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P1	Support	SUB-P1 is generally supported.	Retain SUB-P1 (Recognising and providing for subdivision) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.257	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P2	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P2 (Boundary adjustments and amalgamation) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.165	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P2	Support	SUB-P2 is important as it will help reduce barriers in situations where such re-adjustments can provide cost-effective ways of achieving better development patterns in the city.	Retain SUB-P2 (Boundary adjustments and amalgamation) as notified.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.202	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P2	Support in part	SUB-P2 is generally supported with a minor amendment.	Retain SUB-P2 (Boundary adjustments and amalgamation) with amendment.	Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.203	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P2	Amend	Considers SUB-P2 should be amended to recognise what is anticipated by the underlying zone.	Amend SUB-P2 (Boundary adjustments and amalgamation) as follows: Enable boundary adjustments and site amalgamation to enhance the efficient use of land, provided that the nature and scale of resulting development potential is compatible with the underlying zone ~~local context.~~	Reject	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.138	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P2	Oppose	Consider local context is an important consideration for a consent authority. Local context ties in with the RMA's purpose of sustainable development.	Disallow	Reject	No
Trelissick Park Group	168.18	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Support	Supports that SUB-P3 (Sustainable design) covers stormwater hydraulic neutrality and water sensitive design.	Retain SUB-P3 (Sustainable design) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.258	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P3 (Sustainable design) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.179	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Support in part	Supports the direction in this policy, and its role as a matter of discretion throughout the subdivision chapter.	Retain SUB-P3 (Sustainable design), subject to amendments.	N/A	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.180	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Amend	Considers that proposed RPS Change 1 (policy FW.2) seeks for District Plans to address water demand and include provisions to improve water efficiency. An additional subclause to SUB-P3 regarding encouraging efficient water use would have regard to this policy. The Wellington Regional Public Transport Plan 2021 states Greater Wellington will work with its regional partners to ensure new subdivisions can accommodate public transport. The policy wording can be strengthened for public transport to signal that subdivisions should be designed to ensure public transport routes can be provided for, and vehicles can access those routes. Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policies CC.3 and CC.9 in particular) seeks for District Plans to contribute to reduction in transport-related greenhouse gas emissions. Subdivision design can aid in reducing greenhouse gas emission through actions such as the use of renewable energy, providing infrastructure to enable the use of non-fossil fuel transport and reducing urban sprawl. Policy SUB-P3 should include the need for subdivision design to support greenhouse gas emission reductions	Amend wording in SUB-P3 (Sustainable design) to include 'provide for' public transport, encourage efficient water use and support greenhouse gas emission reductions as follows: … 2a. Encourage the efficient use of water; … 5. Support walking and cycling opportunities, and provide for public transport opportunities, and enhance neighbourhood and network connectivity and safety; ~~and~~ 6. Are adaptive to the effects of climate change. ~~And~~ 7. Support greenhouse gas emission reductions	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.193	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Amend	The submitter requests that an additional clause be added, providing for local and other centres in proposed subdivisions to support reduced reliance on private vehicle travel & reduced emissions. Most large-scale subdivisions, whether it be brownfield or greenfield development, will still contribute to the vitality of the nearest commercial centre. As such, the proximity of the nearest centre should be considered across the board not just in new development areas.	Amend SUB-P3 (Sustainable design) as follows: …7. Considers the ability of future residents to meet their day-today needs within the immediate area.	N/A	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.166	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Support	SUB-P3 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P3 (Sustainable design) as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.204	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Support in part	SUB-P3 is generally supported	Retain SUB-P3 (Sustainable design) with amendment.	Accept	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.5	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.205	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Amend	Considers that SUB-P3 should be amended to provide the flexibility where practicable to achieve such outcomes as not all developments can achieve and attain all aspects in design and layout. Amendments also sought to remove reference to renewable energy as it is already captured under 'natural and physical resources.'	Amend SUB-P3 (Sustainable design) as follows: ~~Provide~~ Encourage and promote ~~for~~ subdivision design and layout that makes efficient use of ~~renewable energy and other~~ natural and physical resources, and delivers well-connected, resilient communities including development patterns that: 1. Maximise solar gain; 2. Incorporate effective water sensitive design where practicable; 3. ~~Achieve~~ Provide for hydraulic neutrality; 4. Provide for safe vehicle access; 5. Support walking, cycling and public transport opportunities and enhance neighbourhood and network connectivity and safety; and 6. Are adaptive to the effects of climate change.	Accept	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.6	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.80	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the submitter's suggested amendments as it weakens the policy direction. The policy as notified has better regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Disallow / Seeks that SUB-P3 is retained as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.11	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Oppose	Oppose weakening of SUB-P3. Hydraulic neutrality is critical to reducing stormwater runoff and subsequent pollution into Wellington Harbour. Also needs to give effect to NPS-FM 2020.	Disallow / Seeks that SUB-P3 is retained as notified to ensure hydraulic neutrality is achieved.	Accept	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.98	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Amend	Considers that effective subdivision design can enable development that provides for the health and well-being of people and communities by managing reverse sensitivity effects on established uses. KiwiRail seek amendment to SUB-P3 to address the potential for adverse effects on the infrastructure, including the rail corridor. The addition of clause 7 ensures adverse effects of activities are rightfully considered at subdivision design stage. This also provides for consistency with Policy INF-P7 in the Infrastructure Chapter and ensures this policy is given effect to as intended. KiwiRail support policy for subdivision design to incorporate water sensitive design and to achieve hydraulic neutrality as provided in clause 2 and 3. KiwiRail seek to ensure neighbouring development does not result in stormwater discharge onto the rail corridor which can compromise the safe and efficient operation of the rail network. KiwiRail further support clause 4 that provides for subdivision with safe vehicle access. KiwiRail seek to ensure safety at rail level crossings is maintained.	Amend SUB-P3 (Sustainable design) as follows: Provide for subdivision design and layout that makes efficient use of renewable energy and other natural and physical resources, and delivers well-connected, resilient communities including development patterns that: 1. Maximise solar gain; 2. Incorporate effective water sensitive design; 3. Achieve hydraulic neutrality; 4. Provide for safe vehicle access; 5. Support walking, cycling and public transport opportunities and enhance neighbourhood and network connectivity and safety; ~~and~~ 6. Are adaptive to the effects of climate change; <u>and</u> 7. <u>Manage adverse effects of activities through setbacks and design controls to achieve appropriate protection of infrastructure.</u>	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.30	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the amendment which is overly prescriptive.	Disallow	Accept	No
Stride Investment Management Limited	FS107.20	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Oppose	Stride considers this is unnecessary in light of the existing measures to enable the safety and efficiency of the transport network, including designations, and it would be inappropriate to require development on adjoining land to do this.	Disallow	Reject	No
Investore Property Limited	FS108.20	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P3	Oppose	This is unnecessary in light of the existing measures to enable the safety and efficiency of the transport network, including designations, and it would be inappropriate to require development on adjoining land to do this.	Disallow	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.259	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P4	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P4 (Integration and layout of subdivision and development) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.167	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P4	Support	SUB-P4 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P4 (Integration and layout of subdivision and development) as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.206	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P4	Support	SUB-P4 is generally supported.	Retain SUB-P4 (Integration and layout of subdivision and development) as notified.	Accept	No
Peter Kelly	16.5	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P5	Amend	Councillors have a democratic mandate to balance the interests of WCC residents against the important natural environment values represented by significant natural areas (SNAs). The Proposed Rules are essentially the Officer Draft Rules, but with the SNA designation removed from all residential zoned land. Requests that if SNAs are returned to residentially zoned land, the provisions in the draft District Plan are reinstated and fine-tuned.	If the Proposed District Plan is amended to allow Significant Natural Areas on residentially zoned land: Seeks that changes are made to SUB (Subdivision) to give effect to the following provision: Amend Draft District Plan SUB-P5 as follows: Provide for..."<u>and minimises vegetation clearance within Significant Natural Areas until 1 July 2027."</u>	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.260	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P5	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P5 (Subdivision for residential activities) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.168	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P5	Support	SUB-P5 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P5 (Subdivision for residential activities) as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.207	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P5	Support	SUB-P5 is generally supported.	Retain SUB-P5 (Subdivision for residential activities) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.261	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P6	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P6 (Subdivision in the General Rural Zone) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.51	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P6	Support	Supports SUB-P6 to the extent that recognition and protection of lawfully established activities is provided for. Regionally Significant Infrastructure (RSI) located within the Rural and future urban zones provides a critical service and is required to operate safely and efficiently. To ensure the efficient operation of RSI the adverse effects of reverse sensitivity need to be suitably recognised and provided for in the PDP, which this provision does.	Retain SUB-P6 (Subdivision in the General Rural Zone) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Waka Kotahi	370.194	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P6	Support	Supports matter 3. "Do not increase the risk of reverse sensitivity effects arising on existing lawfully established activities'.	Retain SUB-P6 (Subdivision in the General Rural Zone) as notified.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.169	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P6	Support	SUB-P6 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P6 (Subdivision in the General Rural Zone) as notified.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.208	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P6	Support	SUB-P6 is generally supported.	Retain SUB-P6 (Subdivision in the General Rural Zone) as notified.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.106	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P7	Support	Supports the policy as it promotes suitable access and connections to the reticulated water supply. Where this is not possible, SUB-P7 expects allotments to accommodate on-site water supply for firefighting purposes. However, in order to ensure that the on-site location, capacity and access to such supply is adequate for FENZ to respond to a fire, it is necessary for the supply to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. It is acknowledged however that existing standard SUB-S2 requires all new allotments, created through subdivision, to comply with the Code so this policy, and associated standards, are fully supported	Retain SUB-P7 (Servicing) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.262	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P7	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P7 (Servicing) as notified.	Accept	Yes
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.181	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P7	Support in part	Supports this requirement to connect to reticulated networks where available.	Retain SUB-P7 (Servicing), subject to amendments.	Accept in part	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.182	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P7	Amend	Considers the PDP should provide for approved alternative wastewater systems anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections are not available. Septic tanks are excluded from this recommendation due to their known issues with leakage of untreated wastewater and nitrates, particularly when poorly maintained. Providing for alternative wastewater treatment options aligns with recommendation 35 of Te Mahere Wai and gives effect to Te Mana o Te Wai. Alternative wastewater treatment options often reduce potable water use significantly. Reducing pressure of new development on the wastewater network may also make intensification in some areas with existing network capacity constraints more feasible. Relevant direction from the operative RPS includes policies 16 and 45. Relevant direction from Proposed RPS Change 1 includes policies FW.2, FW.3 and FW.5, CC.14 and 42(r), FW.5 and 58. Regional plan rules would apply to discharges from all wastewater systems to manage potential impacts on groundwater and surface water quality, aquatic ecosystems and soil health. These requirements could feasibly be met by approved alternative wastewater systems in both brownfield development and greenfield development.	Amend SUB-P7 (Servicing) to include direction in the Subdivision chapter to provide for decentralised wastewater re-use and treatment (of grey and black water) and disposal using alternative wastewater systems (but not septic tanks due to their existing issues with contamination and leaching) anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections are not available. Where connections are available and there is network capacity, a connection to the wastewater network would still be required.	Accept in part	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.183	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P7	Amend	Considers the PDP should provide for approved alternative wastewater systems anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections are not available. Septic tanks are excluded from this recommendation due to their known issues with leakage of untreated wastewater and nitrates, particularly when poorly maintained. Providing for alternative wastewater treatment options aligns with recommendation 35 of Te Mahere Wai and gives effect to Te Mana o Te Wai. Alternative wastewater treatment options often reduce potable water use significantly. Reducing pressure of new development on the wastewater network may also make intensification in some areas with existing network capacity constraints more feasible. Relevant direction from the operative RPS includes policies 16 and 45. Relevant direction from Proposed RPS Change 1 includes policies FW.2, FW.3 and FW.5, CC.14 and 42(r), FW.5 and 58. Regional plan rules would apply to discharges from all wastewater systems to manage potential impacts on groundwater and surface water quality, aquatic ecosystems and soil health. These requirements could feasibly be met by approved alternative wastewater systems in both brownfield development and greenfield development.	Seeks to include any necessary consequential amendments to provide this direction.	Accept	No
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.52	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P7	Support in part	Supports SUB-P7 to the extent that it is clear in that 'all allotments' (urban and rural) are to be adequately serviced by an electricity supply. Considers that the policy should be amended as infrastructure connectivity for 'Additional Infrastructure' should be recognised to the same extent of defined 'Development Infrastructure' at the policy level of the PDP.	Retain SUB-P7 (Servicing) with amendment.	Accept	No
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.53	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P7	Amend	Considers that SUB-P7 should be amended so that infrastructure connectivity for 'Additional Infrastructure' is recognised to the same extent of defined 'Development Infrastructure' at the policy level of the PDP.	Amend SUB-P7 (Servicing) as follows: Require all allotments created by any subdivision to be adequately serviced such that: … 3. S<u>uitable connections to</u> ~~t~~<u>t</u>elecommunications and electricity are supplied.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.170	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P7	Support	SUB-P7 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P7 (Servicing) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.209	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P7	Support	SUB-P7 is generally supported.	Retain SUB-P7 (Servicing) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.263	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P8	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P8 (Esplanade requirements) as notified.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.171	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P8	Support	SUB-P8 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P8 (Esplanade requirements) as notified.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.210	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P8	Support	SUB-P8 is generally supported.	Retain SUB-P8 (Esplanade requirements) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.264	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P9	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P9 (Subdivision of land within a site or area of significance to Māori Category A or B) as notified.	Accept	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.172	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P9	Support	SUB-P9 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P9 (Subdivision of land within a site or area of significance to Māori Category A or B) as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.211	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P9	Support	SUB-P9 is generally supported.	Retain SUB-P9 (Subdivision of land within a site or area of significance to Māori Category A or B) as notified.	Accept	Yes
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.55	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P9	Support in part	Supports the policy managing subdivision within Category A and B Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori. [Inferred reason]	Retain SUB-P9 (Subdivision of land within a site or area of significance to Māori Category A or B) with amendments.	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.116	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P9	Support	Greater Wellington support provisions which seek to protect Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.	Allow / Seek provisions which protect SASM.	Accept in part	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.56	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P9	Amend	Considers that the policy could go further than presently drafted. [Inferred reason]	Amend SUB-P9 (Subdivision of land within a site or area of significance to Māori Category A or B) by requiring partnership and engagement with mana whenua rather than just having regard to the extent of consultation with mana whenua.	Accept in part	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.117	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P9	Support	Greater Wellington support provisions which seek to protect Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.	Allow / Seek provisions which protect SASM.	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.97	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Amend	Considers an additional matter should be included in SUB-P10 (Subdivision of land on which a heritage building or heritage structure is located) for consistency with SUB-P11 (Subdivision within heritage areas).	Amend SUB-P10 (Subdivision of land on which a heritage building or heritage structure is located) as follows: Provide for the subdivision of land on which heritage buildings and heritage structures are located, having regard to: a. The extent to which the subdivision and any anticipated development would detract from the identified heritage values; ~~1.~~b. The identified relationship and contribution of the setting and surroundings of the site to the values of the heritage building or heritage structure; ~~2.~~c. The extent to which the subdivision would retain an appropriate setting for the heritage building or heritage structure; and ~~3.~~d. Whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on any new allotment to manage any anticipated development.	Accept	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.7	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Support	The additional matter appropriately addresses the potential for adverse effects on heritage values.	Allow	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.265	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P10 (Subdivision of land on which a heritage building or heritage structure is located) as notified.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.173	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Support	SUB-P10 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P10 (Subdivision of land on which a heritage building or heritage structure is located) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.212	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Support in part	SUB-P10 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought to remove reference to whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on new allotment to manage any anticipated development.	Retain SUB-P10 (Subdivision of land on which a heritage building or heritage structure is located) with amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.213	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Amend	Considers that SUB-P10 should be amended to remove reference to whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on new allotment to manage any anticipated development. Anticipated development is provided for within the framework of the underlying zone and relevant district plan provisions, and covenants and consent notices are tools that are currently provided for when necessary and appropriate under current legislation.	Amend SUB-P10 (Subdivision of land on which a heritage building or heritage structure is located) as follows: Provide for the subdivision of land on which heritage buildings and heritage structures are located, having regard to: 1. The identified relationship and contribution of the setting and surroundings of the site to the values of the heritage building or heritage structure; 2. The extent to which the subdivision would retain an appropriate setting for the heritage building or heritage structure; and 3. ~~Whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on any new allotment to manage any anticipated development.~~	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.8	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUBP10	Oppose	Reference to covenants or consent notices are appropriate methods for ongoing protection of heritage values. It is useful for applicants and decision makers are reminded of these methods when assessing applications for subdivision. [Inferred reference to submission 391.213]	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Reject	No
LIVE WELLington	FS96.15	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUBP10	Oppose	We oppose removal of regard for covenants and consent notices. It is appropriate to allow for covenants to control development for heritage buildings.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Roland Sapsford	FS117.14	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Oppose	Roland Sapsford opposes removal of regard for covenants and consent notices. It is appropriate to allow for covenants to control development for heritage buildings.	Disallow	Accept in part	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.58	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Amend	Considers that advice from a qualified heritage professional, included in SUB-P12 (subdivision in archaeological sites), is also important to include as a point under the policies for sub-divisions involving heritage buildings and areas to ensure adverse effects are avoided or mitigated.	Amend policy SUB-P10 (Subdivision of land on which a heritage building or heritage structure is located) as follows: Provide for the subdivision of land on which heritage buildings and heritage structures are located, having regard to: 1. The identified relationship and contribution of the setting and surroundings of the site to the values of the heritage building or heritage structure; 2. The extent to which the subdivision would retain an appropriate setting for the heritage building or heritage structure; ~~and~~ 3. Whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on any new allotment to manage any anticipated development and; 4. The findings of any advice by a suitably qualified heritage professional;	Accept	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.59	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Amend	Considers that consideration of any buildings and structures associated with the heritage values of the heritage building or structure should be considered.	Amend policy SUB-P10 (Subdivision of land on which a heritage building or heritage structure is located) as follows: Provide for the subdivision of land on which heritage buildings and heritage structures are located, having regard to: 1. The identified relationship and contribution of associated buildings and structures, ~~of~~ and the setting and surroundings of the site to the values of the heritage building or heritage structure; 2. The extent to which the subdivision would retain an appropriate setting for the heritage building or heritage structure; and 3. Whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on any new allotment to manage any anticipated development.	Accept	Yes
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.60	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P10	Amend	Considers that there are no rules or standards to achieve the outcomes in SUB-P10 to 12. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that SUB-P10 (Subdivision of land on which a heritage building or heritage structure is located) be added as a restricted discretionary rule.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.266	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P11	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P11 (Subdivision within heritage areas) as notified.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.174	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P11	Support	SUB-P11 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P11 (Subdivision within heritage areas) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.214	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P11	Support in part	SUB-P11 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought to remove reference to whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on new allotment to manage any anticipated development, as consistent with the relief sought within this submission.	Retain SUB-P11 (Subdivision within heritage areas) with amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.215	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P11	Amend	Considers that SUB-P11 should be amended to remove reference to whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on new allotment to manage any anticipated development, as consistent with the relief sought within this submission.	Amend SUB-P11 (Subdivision within heritage areas) as follows: Provide for the subdivision of land within heritage areas, having regard to: 1. The extent to which the subdivision and any anticipated development would detract from the identified heritage values; and 2. ~~Whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on any new allotment to manage any anticipated development.~~	Reject	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.9	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUBP11	Oppose	Reference to covenants or consent notices are appropriate methods for ongoing protection of heritage values. It is useful for applicants and decision makers are reminded of these methods when assessing applications for subdivision.	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Accept	No
LIVE WELLington	FS96.16	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUBP11	Oppose	Removal of regard for covenants and consent notices is opposed. It is appropriate to allow for covenants to control development for heritage areas.	Disallow	Accept	No
Roland Sapsford	FS117.15	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P11	Oppose	Removal of regard for covenants and consent notices is opposed. It is appropriate to allow for covenants to control development for heritage areas.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.61	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P11	Amend	Considers that advice from a qualified heritage professional, included in SUB-P12 (subdivision in archaeological sites), is also important to include as a point under the policies for sub-divisions involving heritage buildings and areas to ensure adverse effects are avoided or mitigated.	Amend HH-P11 (Subdivision within heritage areas) as follows: Provide for the subdivision of land within heritage areas, having regard to: 1. The extent to which the subdivision and any anticipated development would detract from the identified heritage values; ~~and~~ 2. Whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on any new allotment to manage any anticipated development; and 3. The findings of any advice by a suitably qualified heritage professional.	Accept	Yes
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.62	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P11	Amend	Considers that there are no rules or standards to achieve the outcomes in SUB-P10 to 12. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that SUB-P11 (Subdivision within heritage areas) be added as a restricted discretionary rule.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.267	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P12	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P12 (Subdivision of land containing a scheduled archaeological site) as notified.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.175	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P12	Support	SUB-P12 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P12 (Subdivision of land containing a scheduled archaeological site) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.216	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P12	Support in part	SUB-P12 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought to remove reference to whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on new allotment to manage any anticipated development, as consistent with the relief sought within this submission.	Retain SUB-P12 (Subdivision of land containing a scheduled archaeological site) with amendment.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.217	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P12	Amend	Considers that SUB-P12 should be amended to remove reference to whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on new allotment to manage any anticipated development, as consistent with the relief sought within this submission.	Amend SUB-P12 (Subdivision of land containing a scheduled archaeological site) as follows: Provide for the subdivision of land containing a scheduled archaeological site, having regard to: … 4. The outcomes of any consultation with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga; and 5. ~~Whether controls such as covenants or consent notices can be imposed on any new allotment to manage anticipated development.~~	Accept	No
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	FS9.10	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P12	Oppose	Reference to covenants or consent notices are appropriate methods for ongoing protection of heritage values. It is useful for applicants and decision makers are reminded of these methods when assessing applications for subdivision.	Disallow / Retain as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.63	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P12	Support	Supports the inclusion of the outcomes of consultation with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga to ensure that any archaeological authority provisions are recognised.	Retain SUB-P12 (Subdivision of land containing a scheduled archaeological site) as notified.	Accept	Yes
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.64	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P12	Amend	Considers that there are no rules or standards to achieve the outcomes in SUB-P10 to 12. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that SUB-P12 (Subdivision of land containing a scheduled archaeological site) be added as a restricted discretionary rule.	Accept in part	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.268	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P13	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P13 (Subdivision of land containing a notable tree) as notified.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.176	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P13	Support	SUB-P13 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P13 (Subdivision of land containing a notable tree) as notified.	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.218	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P13	Support in part	SUB-P13 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought to remove reference to whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on new allotment to manage any anticipated development, as consistent with the relief sought within this submission.	Retain SUB-P13 (Subdivision of land containing a notable tree) with amendment.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.219	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P13	Amend	Considers that SUB-P13 should be amended to remove reference to whether covenants or consent notices can be imposed on new allotment to manage any anticipated development, as consistent with the relief sought within this submission.	Amend SUB-P13 (Subdivision of land containing a notable tree) as follows: Require subdivision of land containing notable trees to support the maintenance of tree health and minimise the potential for interference, having regard to: 1. The extent to which the location of new boundaries relative to the notable tree and any anticipated development will increase the risk of the interference with property; 2. ~~Whether controls such as consent notices or covenants can be imposed on any new allotment;~~ and ~~3~~ 2. Whether site access and new utilities can be located outside of the root protection area of the notable tree.	Accept in part	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.269	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P14	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P14 (Subdivision within riparian margins) as notified.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.184	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P14	Oppose in part	Opposes the use of 'provide for' relating to subdivision in riparian margins. The proposed policy does not contribute to NATC-O1 to preserve and protect natural character within riparian margins from inappropriate subdivision.	Opposes SUB-P14 (Subdivision within riparian margins) and seeks amendment.	No decision specified	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.185	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P14	Amend	Opposes the use of 'provide for' relating to subdivision in riparian margins. The proposed policy does not contribute to NATC-O1 to preserve and protect natural character within riparian margins from inappropriate subdivision.	Amend SUB-P14 (Subdivision within riparian margins) as follows: ~~Provide for subdivision within riparian margins where:~~ ~~1. The natural character is protected; and The subdivisions is designed to minimise the adverse effects of future use and development enabled by the subdivision on the natural character.~~ Only allow for subdivision in riparian margins where adverse effect on natural character are avoided, and other adverse effects on natural character are avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.32	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P14	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GWRC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.177	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P14	Support	SUB-P14 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P14 (Subdivision within riparian margins) as notified.	Reject	No
Trelissick Park Group	168.19	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P15	Oppose	Considers that subdivision should not be allowed in significant natural areas.	Delete SUB-P15 (Protection of significant natural areas) as notified (as subdivision should not be allowed in significant natural areas).	Accept	No
Tyers Stream Group	221.67	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P15	Not specified	Considers that the main issue with the provision is that this has no effect in the absence of any SNAs on private residential land.	Not specified.	Accept	No
Tyers Stream Group	221.68	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P15	Not specified	Considers that avoid is a high bar for subdivision to cross, except for the 'where practicable'. The effects management hierarchy is very similar to that proposed in the NPSIB.	Seeks that accounting mechanism be developed if offsetting and compensation is contemplated and suggests this could be a fund to deliver more or better biodiversity elsewhere, on a 'net gain' basis.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.270	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P15	Support in part	e introduction to this chapter states that it contains policies and rules that implement the objectives in the ECO chapter, where subdivision affects an SNA. We note that this chapter has taken the approach of replicating (although not exactly) some of the policies from the ECO chapter. An alternative approach would be to cross reference the EC policies in this chapter. Either can work, however, care needs to be taken to be clear which policies apply to subdivision, and to ensure that all relevant policies are included in the subdivision chapter. Because the ECO policies already apply to subdivision (e.g. ECO P1, P3) it may be simpler to cross reference the ECO policies in this subdivision chapter.	Amend SUB-P15 (Protection of significant natural areas) to refer to ECO policies to avoid repetition. Protect significant natural areas by applying ECO-P1, ECO-P3, ECO XX (re maintenance of biodiversity) and ECO P5.	No decision specified	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.271	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P15	Support in part	If the replication approach is retained, there will also need to be replication of ECO P5, to ensure that the NZCPS is given effect to.	Amend SUB-P15 (Protection of significant natural areas) to align with relief sought on ECO policies: Protect the biodiversity values of ~~the identified~~ significant natural areas ~~within SCHED8~~ by requiring subdivision, use and development to: 1. Avoid adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity in the coastal environment to the extent stated in ECO P5 (or reference the replicated SUB policy); 2. Avoid the following adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values: a. Loss of ecosystem representation and extent; b. Disruption to sequences, mosaics or ecosystem function; c. Fragmentation or loss of buffering or connectivity within the SNA and between other indigenous habitats and ecosystems; and d. A reduction in population size or occupancy of threatened species using the SNA for any part of their life cycle. 3. Avoid other adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity values where practicable; 4. ~~Minimise~~ Mitigate adverse effects on the biodiversity values where avoidance is not practicable; 5. Remedy adverse effects on the biodiversity values where they cannot be avoided or mitigated ~~minimised;~~ 6. Only consider biodiversity offsetting for any residual adverse effects that cannot otherwise be avoided, mitigated ~~minimised~~ or remedied and where the principles of APP2 – Biodiversity Offsetting are met~~; and~~ 7. ~~Only consider biodiversity compensation after first considering biodiversity offsetting and where the principles of APP3 – Biodiversity Compensation are met~~	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.178	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P15	Support	SUB-P15 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P15 (Protection of significant natural areas) as notified.	Reject	No
Director-General of Conservation	385.50	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P15	Support	Supports proposed Policy SUB-P15 (Protection of significant natural areas).	Retain policy SUB-P15 (Protection of significant natural areas) as notified.	Accept	No
Trelissick Park Group	168.20	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P16	Oppose	Considers that subdivision should not be allowed in significant natural areas.	Delete SUB-P16 (Subdivision in significant natural areas) as notified (as subdivision should not be allowed in significant natural areas).	Accept	No
Tyers Stream Group	221.69	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P16	Not specified	Considers that the main issue with the provision is that this has no effect in the absence of any SNAs on private residential land.	Not specified.	No decision specified	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.272	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P16	Support in part	Seeks to delete this policy, and include the following policy as a replacement for SUB P15 and P16: SUB P-15 Protection of, and subdivision in significant natural areas Protect significant natural areas by applying ECO-P1, ECO-P3, ECO XX (re maintenance of biodiversity) and ECO P5.	Delete SUB-P16 (Subdivision in significant natural areas) if cross reference policy relief is accepted for SUB-P15 (Protection of significant natural areas): Protect significant natural areas by applying ECO-P1, ECO-P3, ECO XX (re maintenance of biodiversity) and ECO P5.	No decision specified.	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.273	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P16	Support in part	If the replication approach is retained, we seek amendments as per our submission points on ECO P3. We also note that this policy is slightly different from ECO-P3. It is not clear why this is. While this policy includes considerations absent from ECO-P3 (which are supported), arguably this policy applies a lesser standard, in that all that is required is that certain things are taken into account – typically the extent to which something is provided. ECO- P3 in contrast requires e.g. 'ensures that the ecological processes' (ECO-P3.4). As such, we prefer the formulation from ECO-P3, and have added the relevant additional requirements parts from SUB P16 below. We would also accept different wording, as long as the wording is clear that certain things must be achieved, not simply taken into account, or required to an extent.	Amend SUB-P16 (Subdivision in significant natural areas): Only a~~A~~llow for subdivision, use and development in significant natural areas ~~listed in SCHED8~~ where it: 1. Applies the effects management hierarchy approach in SUB P15; and 2. Demonstrates that it is appropriate, including by taking into account the findings of an ecological assessment for the activity in accordance with APP15; and 3. Provides protective covenants of the significant natural area; 4. Minimises fragmentation of the significant natural area; 5. Locates building platforms and vehicle accessways within the new lots outside the significant natural area; and 6. Ensures the activities effects on biodiversity values are appropriately managed in accordance with the effects management hierarchy, and where residual effects remain after avoiding, remedying or mitigating, ~~to~~ achieve no net loss of biodiversity values of the ~~identified~~ significant natural area; and 7. Ensures that the ecological processes, functions and integrity of the significant natural area are maintained.	Accept	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.179	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P16	Support	SUB-P16 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P16 (Subdivision in significant natural areas) as notified.	Accept	Yes
Director-General of Conservation	385.51	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P16	Support	Supports proposed Policy SUB-P16 (Subdivision in significant natural areas).	Retain policy SUB-P16 (Subdivision in significant natural areas) as notified.	Accept in part	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
John Tiley	142.14	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P17	Oppose	Oppose SUB-P17 (Subdivision of land within ridgeline and hilltops) as the concept of subdividing on ridgelines does a disservice to the city's landscape values, expressed in other plans and policies over the last twenty years.	Not specified.	Reject	No
Churton Park Community Association	189.14	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P17	Oppose	Oppose SUB-17 as the concept of subdividing on ridgelines does a disservice to the city's landscape values, expressed in other plans and policies over the last twenty years.	Not specified.	Accept	No
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.21	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P17	Amend	Considers that Marshall's Ridge should be given protection through the strengthening of the policy.	Amend SUB-P17 (Subdivision of land within ridgeline and hilltops) to give further protection to Marshall's Ridge and other ridgelines within the area.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.274	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P17	Support in part	Considers the policy broadly replicates NFL P2. We seek the same amendments sought for that policy here.	Amend SUB-P17 (Subdivision of land within ridgeline and hilltops) to align with relief sought on NFL-P2.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.180	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P17	Support	SUB-P17 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P17 (Subdivision of land within ridgeline and hilltops) as notified.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.275	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P18	Support in part	Considers the policy broadly replicates NFL P3 and P4. We seek the same amendments sought for those policies here.	Amend SUB-P18 (Subdivision of land within special amenity landscapes) to align with relief sought on NFL-P3 and NFL-P4.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.181	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P18	Support	SUB-P18 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P18 (Subdivision of land within special amenity landscapes) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.276	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P19	Support in part	Supports the intent of this policy but have concerns regarding "Only allow" wording in ONFLs. As per the submission points on SCHED10 and NFL-P5, opposes the use of "identified" given the shortcomings of SCHED10. Seeks the same amendments sought for that policy here.	Amend SUB-P19 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes located outside of the coastal environment) to align with relief sought on NFL-P5.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.182	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P19	Support	SUB-P19 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P19 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes located outside of the coastal environment) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.277	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P20	Support in part	Considers the policy broadly replicates NFL P5. Seeks the same amendments sought for that policy here.	Amend SUB-P20 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes located within the coastal environment) to align with relief sought on NFL-P5.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.183	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P20	Support	SUB-P20 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P20 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes located within the coastal environment) as notified.	Reject	No
Director-General of Conservation	385.52	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P20	Support	Supports proposed Policy SUB-P20 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes located within the coastal environment).	Retain policy SUB-P20 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes located within the coastal environment) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.278	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P21	Support in part	Considers the policy broadly replicates NFL P6. Seeks the same amendments sought for that policy here.	Amend SUB-P21 (Subdivision of land within the landward extent of the coastal environment) to align with relief sought on NFL-P6.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.184	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P21	Support	SUB-P21 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P21 (Subdivision of land within the landward extent of the coastal environment) as notified.	Reject	No
Director-General of Conservation	385.53	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P21	Support	Supports proposed Policy SUB-P21 (Subdivision of land within the landward extent of the coastal environment).	Retain policy SUB-P21 (Subdivision of land within the landward extent of the coastal environment) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.279	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P22	Support in part	Considers the policy appears to replicate policy CE P5. Seeks the same amendments sought in relation to CE P5 to this policy.	Amend SUB-P22 (Subdivision of land within high coastal natural character areas) to align with relief sought on CE-P5.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.185	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P22	Support	SUB-P22 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P22 (Subdivision of land within high coastal natural character areas) as notified.	Accept	No
Director-General of Conservation	385.54	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P22	Support	Supports proposed Policy SUB-P22 (Subdivision of land within high coastal natural character areas).	Retain policy SUB-P22 (Subdivision of land within high coastal natural character areas) as notified.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.280	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P23	Support in part	Considers the policy broadly replicates CE P6. Seeks the same amendments sought for that policy here.	Amend SUB-P23 (Subdivision of land within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment located inside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone or City Centre Zone) to align with relief sought on CE-P6.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.186	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P23	Support	SUB-P23 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P23 (Subdivision of land within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment located inside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone or City Centre Zone) as notified.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.281	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P24	Support in part	Considers the policy broadly replicates CE P7. Seeks the same amendments sought for that policy here.	Amend SUB-P24 (Subdivision of land within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment located outside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone and City Centre Zone) to align with relief sought on CE-P7.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.187	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P24	Support	SUB-P24 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P24 (Subdivision of land within coastal margins and riparian margins in the coastal environment located outside the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone and City Centre Zone) as notified.	Accept	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.107	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P25	Support	Supports the policy as it seeks to take a risk-based approach to the management of subdivision of land in locations where there is significant risk from natural hazards. This objective achieves the purpose of the RMA by providing for the safety and wellbeing of people and communities and addresses the risk to property across the city.	Retain SUB-P25 (Subdivision of land affected by natural hazards) as notified.	Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.13	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P25	Support	Supports this policy and the risk based approach to reducing natural hazard risk.	Retain SUB-P25 (Subdivision of land affected by natural hazards) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.282	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P25	Support in part	Considers the policy broadly replicates CE P11. Seeks the same amendments sought for that policy here.	Amend SUB-P25 (Subdivision of land affected by natural hazards) to align with relief sought on CE-P11.	Accept in part	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.186	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P25	Support	Considers this approach is appropriate.	Retain SUB-P25 (Subdivision of land affected by natural hazards) as notified.	Accept	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.188	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P25	Support	SUB-P25 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P25 (Subdivision of land affected by natural hazards) as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.220	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P25	Support	SUB-P25 is generally supported.	Retain SUB-P25 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the Wellington Fault Overlay, the Ohariu Fault Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Accept in part	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.14	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P26	Support	Supports this policy and the risk reduction measures being planned for in and around the port and railway areas of the Wellington Fault Overlay.	Retain SUB-26 (Subdivision of land within the port and railway yards within the Wellington Fault Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.283	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P26	Support	Supports the policy.	Retain SUB-P26 (Subdivision of land within the port and railway yards within the Wellington Fault Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.187	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P26	Amend	Considers it appropriate to make amendments to bring the policy in line with the Objectives 19 and 20 and Policies 51 and 52 in Proposed RPS Change 1. Minimise is defined as "as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP)" and is in line with standard risk-based hazard management approaches. This leaves room for reduction as far as practicable but is a clearer signal than reduce or do not increase, to actively look to bring down the risk in the design and planning of the development.	Amend SUB-P26 (Subdivision of land within the port and railway yards within the Wellington Fault Overlay) as follows: Require subdivision of land within the port and railway yards within the Wellington Fault Overlay to incorporate mitigation measures that minimise the ~~reduce or avoid an increase in~~ risk to people, property and infrastructure from the ground shaking and fault rupture on the Wellington Fault.	Accept	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.33	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P26	Support	Toka Tū Ake EQC consider it appropriate for terminology consistent with GWRC proposed RPS Change 1, based on standard risk based hazard management approaches, to be used throughout the WCC proposed district plan. We agree that 'minimise' natural hazard risk is a clearer instruction to bring risk in development to levels as low as reasonably practical than 'reduce' and 'reduce or do not increase'.	Allow	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.189	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P26	Support	SUB-P26 is important as it signals the type of subdivision the city needs to improve its sustainability and liveability in support of subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-P26 (Subdivision of land within the port and railway yards within the Wellington Fault Overlay) as notified.	Reject	No
CentrePort Limited	402.110	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-P26	Oppose	Opposes SUB-P26 because the policy doesn't equate the process of subdivision per se which is not the land use or any structure which may be at to increased risk from the Wellington Fault. This is included in the Natural Hazards chapter.	Delete SUB-P26 (Subdivision of land within the port and railway yards within the Wellington Fault Overlay) in its entirety.	Reject	No
Peter Kelly	16.6	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Amend	Councillors have a democratic mandate to balance the interests of WCC residents against the important natural environment values represented by significant natural areas (SNAs). The Proposed Rules are essentially the Officer Draft Rules, but with the SNA designation removed from all residential zoned land. Requests that if SNAs are returned to residentially zoned land, the provisions in the draft District Plan are reinstated and fine-tuned.	If the Proposed District Plan is amended to allow Significant Natural Areas on residentially zoned land: Seeks that changes are made to SUB (Subdivision) to give effect to the following provision: Amend Draft District Plan SUB-R1 as follows: ... 8. Minimising vegetation loss within a Significant Natural Area.	Accept	Yes
Chorus New Zealand Limited	88.1	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Support	The SUB-R1 is supported as it ensures populations in the Medium Density Residential Zone and High Density Residential Zone have provision for fibre optic cables and continue to have access to world-class connectivity. If not provided at the time of subdivision, retroactively providing fibre optic cable connections can result in unnecessary and disruptive works and increased costs to the end user.	Retain SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) as notified.	Accept	No
Rachel Marr	89.1	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Oppose	Opposes the non-notification clauses under SUB-R1 on the basis that subdivision can cause problems and judicial review is often too late to rectify the issue. Considers that an open policy that allows for the public to voice any concerns before the subdevelopment begins, would make it a smoother process during the subdevelopment and manage expectations. [See original submission for further detail]	Seeks an amendment to SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) for a more open process for consents with notification when neighbours will obviously be adversely affected by the work.	Accept	No
Design Network Architecture Limited	259.1	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Amend	This rule has a notification preclusion relating to certain situations where there are 4 or more units complying with certain standards. For example, MRZ-S7 is a standard which specifically states it does not apply to multi-unit housing listed as a provision to be complied with for the notification preclusion for 4 or more units in SUB-R1, despite MRZ-S7 saying that it doesn't apply to multi-unit housing. This wording needs to be made clearer.	Seeks that SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) is amended so that where a standard does not apply to multi-unit housing, it is not highlighted as being necessary to consider under a notification preclusion.	This will be addressed in the Sign hearing	N/A
Wellington City Council	266.98	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Oppose in part	Considers the rule does not have legal effect.	Remove the gavel for SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone)	Accept in part	No
Wellington City Council	266.99	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of control from rule SUB-R1.1.7 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) as follows: ~~Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary~~	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.108	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Support	Supports the rule as it controls the provision of water supply for subdivision for the purpose of establishing residential units in the Medium and High Density Residential zones. The matters of control include the provision of a water supply connection for each allotment that meets the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008, this is strongly supported by FENZ.	Retain SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) as notified.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.65	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Support	Supports SUB-R1 to the extent it reflects MDRS clause 3.	Retain SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) as notified.	Reject	No
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.66	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Support in part	Supports permitted activity status for signs P-1's provisions for appropriate signs, but opposes signs being required to meet all of the matters contained in the list. For example, an entrance sign for a retirement village is required but it is not to meet a regulatory or statutory requirement.	Amend Sign-P1 so signs are not required to comply with all of the listed matters, particularly (4) and (7).	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.54	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Support in part	Supports SUB-R1 as the subdivision of land associated with medium and high density land use development is required to be a controlled activity. Consideration of the NPSUD requirements is supported, with new records of title being certified under 223 and 224 of the RMA in conjunction with permitted development being controlled to the extent that a suitable connection to an electricity supply is provided.	Retain SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) with amendment.	Accept	No
Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.55	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Amend	Considers that SUB-R1 should be amended to be more robust regarding the degree of connection. As currently worded the Rule the "provision of electricity" does not instil an expectation that a safe and secure supply to an electricity supply network; but rather, merely that any given development has provision to the network. It is also noted that equipment is likely to also be required, which should be considered to facilitate the connection, not the development to an electricity supply.	Amend SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) as follows: … 6. ~~The provision of~~ That connections to a safe and secure electricity supply network are provided ~~connections~~ to the legal boundary ~~or~~ of each allotment; and …	Accept in part	No
Waka Kotahi	370.195	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Amend	Seeks an additional matter of control relating to the management of adverse effects on noise.	Amend SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) as follows: … 6. The provision of electricity connections to the legal boundary or each allotment; and 7. Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary.; and 8. Any potential adverse effects of site development on the efficient use and operation of the roading and state highway network.	N/A	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.61	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / SUB-R1	Support	Supports the additional clause 8 but seeks that this matter is broadened to also consider potential adverse effects on the efficient use and operation of the rail network. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Amend / Adopt amendment sought and include rail corridor within provision	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.18	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the introduction of the proposed new matter of control.	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.190	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Support	SUB-R1 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) as notified.	N/A	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.221	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Support in part	SUB-R1 is generally supported, but amendments are sought in matters of control.	Retain SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) with amendment.	Reject	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.7	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Accept	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.222	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Amend	Considers that SUB-R1 should be amended so that its matters of control are more consistent with other rules and standards in the Subdivision chapter. This would also be more appropriate with standards that are required to be complied with.	Amend SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) as follows: 1. Activity status: Controlled Matters of control are: 1. The provision of practical, physical and legal access from each allotment directly to a formed legal road or by registered right of way; 2. Whether the subdivision necessitates a joint land use application. 3. Compliance with SUB-S1, SUB-S2, SUB-S3, SUBS4, and SUB-S5 ~~2. The provision of a water supply connection to the Council's reticulated water supply system for each allotment sufficient to meet the levels of service in the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services 2022 and the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008;~~ ~~3. The provision of a wastewater disposal connection to Council's reticulated wastewater system for each allotment sufficient to meet the level of service in the Wellington Regional Standard for Water Services 2022;~~ ~~4. The provision of a stormwater connection to Council's reticulated stormwater system for each allotment sufficient to meet the level of service in the Wellington Regional Standard for Water Services 2022;~~ ~~5. The provision of fibre optic cable connections to the legal boundary of each allotment;~~ ~~6. The provision of electricity connections to the legal boundary or each allotment; and~~ ~~7. Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary.~~ ...	Accept in part	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	FS14.1	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Oppose	Fire and Emergency opposes the deletion of #2 matter of control relating to the provision of a water supply and firefighting water supply. Fire and Emergency consider it vital that the plan contains provisions which ensure all new land use development and subdivisions are supplied with an adequate firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, to provide for operational firefighting requirements. In order for Fire and Emergency to achieve its principal objective which includes protecting and preserving life and preventing or limiting damage to property, land and the environment, it is critical that water supply infrastructure of adequate capacity, pressures and accessibility is in place prior to development commencing. The Code of Practice sets out the minimum requirements for firefighting water and access in order for Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently in an emergency.	Disallow / Retain "The provision of a water supply connection to the Council's reticulated water supply system for each allotment sufficient to meet the levels of service int he Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services 2022 and the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008." as a matter of control for SUB-R1.	Accept	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.8	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.27	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R1	Amend	Considers that the notification status statement erroneously includes compliance with MRZ-S1 for subdivision for 4+ units when the standard only applies to subdivisions with 1-3 units.	Amend SUB-R1 (Subdivision for the purpose of the construction and use of residential units in the Medium Density Residential Zone or High Density Residential Zone) to: Applications under this rule are precluded from being publicly notified or limited notified if the subdivision is only associated with residential units that fully comply with density standards MRZ-S1, ~~MRZ-S2,~~ MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4, MRZ-S5, MRZ-S6, MRZ-S7 and MRZ-S8 in the Medium Density Residential Zone; or HRZ-S1, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S4, HRZIS5, HRZ-S6, HRZ-S7, HRZ-S8 and HRZ-S9 in the High Density Residential Zone. Applications under this rule are precluded from being publicly or limited notified if the subdivision is associated with an application for the construction and use of 4 or more residential units that comply with density standards ~~MRZ-S1~~, MRZ-S2, MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4, MRZ-S5, MRZ-S6, MRZIS7 and MRZ-S8 in the Medium Density Residential Zone; or HRZ-S1, HRZ-S3, HRZ-S4, HRZ-S5, HRZ-S6, HRZ-S7, HRZIS8 and HRZ-S9 in the High Density Residential Zone.	N/A	No
Wellington City Council	266.100	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R2	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of discretion from rule SUB-R2.2.4 (Subdivision around an existing lawfully established building which does not result in the creation of any new undeveloped allotment) as follows: ~~Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary~~	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.109	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R2	Support	Supports the rule subject to the relief sought regarding SUB-S1 and SUB-S2, which will ensure water supply and access matters are sufficiently addressed for all new allotments. FENZ considers this will help ensure the safety and wellbeing of life, property, and the environment in relation to fire risk. FENZ considers the matters of discretion for Restricted Discretionary activities for SUB-R2, provide Council with the necessary scope to consider firefighting water supply and access matters, through consideration of SUB-P7 and the extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard.	Retain SUB-R2 (Subdivision around an existing lawfully established building which does not result in the creation of any new undeveloped allotment) as notified. Support of this rule is subject to requested amendments to SUB-S1 and SUB-S2.	Accept in part	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.191	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R2	Support	SUB-R2 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R2 (Subdivision around an existing lawfully established building which does not result in the creation of any new undeveloped allotment) as notified.	Accept	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.223	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R2	Support in part	SUB-R2 is partially supported, with the expectation that it may be amended to fit with other proposed requirements. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain SUB-R2 (Subdivision around an existing lawfully established building which does not result in the creation of any new undeveloped allotment), with conditional amendment. [Refer to original submission]	Accept in part	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.9	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R2	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.28	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R2	Amend	Consider that all subdivision rules should include the ability to assess and claim existing use rights for standards that are not met for existing buildings or situations.	Amend SUB-R2 (Subdivision around an existing lawfully established building which does not result in the creation of any new undeveloped allotment) to: c. The subdivision will not ~~lead to, or~~ increase the degree of, non-compliance with land use standards of the applicable Zone.	Accept	Yes
Rod Halliday	25.23	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R3	Amend	Considers that the 100m setback distance in SUB-R3.2 is arbitrary and may incur risks to the applicant.	Delete SUB-R3 (Boundary adjustments) 3.2.e in its entirety.	N/A	No
Wellington City Council	266.101	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R3	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of control/discretion from rule SUB-R3.2.5 (Boundary adjustments) and 3.3.8 as follows: ~~Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary~~	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.110	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R3	Support	Supports the rule subject to the relief sought regarding SUB-S1 and SUB-S2, which will ensure water supply and access matters are sufficiently addressed for all new allotments as both a permitted and controlled activity. Further, matters of control consider SUB-P7. FENZ considers this will help ensure the safety and wellbeing of life, property, and the environment in relation to fire risk. FENZ considers the matters of discretion for Restricted Discretionary activities for SUB-R3, provide Council with the necessary scope to consider firefighting water supply and access matters, through consideration of SUB-P7 and the extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard.	Retain SUB-R3 (Boundary adjustments) as notified.	Accept	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.192	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R3	Support	SUB-R3 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R3 (Boundary adjustments) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.224	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R3	Support in part	SUB-R3 is partially supported, with the expectation that it may be amended to fit with other proposed requirements. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain SUB-R3 (Boundary adjustments), with conditional amendment. [Refer to original submission]	Accept in part	Yes
Hilary Watson	FS74.10	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R3	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.29	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R3	Amend	Considers that all subdivision rules should include the ability to assess and claim existing use rights for standards that are not met for existing buildings or situations.	Amend SUB-R3 (Boundary adjustments) to: c. The subdivision will not ~~lead to, or~~ increase the degree of, non-compliance with land use standards of the applicable Zone.	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.102	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R4	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of control/discretion from rule SUB-R4.1.3 and 4.2.4 (Subdivision to create a new allotment for infrastructure) as follows: ~~Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary~~	Accept in part	No
Waka Kotahi	370.196	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R4	Support in part	Supports with amendments, noted below.	Supports with amendment, noted below.	N/A	No
Waka Kotahi	370.197	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R4	Amend	The submitter concurs that subdivision for the sole purpose of providing infrastructure should be a controlled activity, however, considers that this rule should reference that it must be sought by a Network Utility Operator and this rule should not be subject to SUB-S6 (minimum dimension size) as this would result in an unnecessary burden on acquiring sites to deliver necessary infrastructure outcomes. Non-compliance with SUB-R4 should be retained as a Restricted Discretionary activity	Amend SUB-R4 (Subdivision to create a new allotment for infrastructure) as follows: Subdivision to create a new allotment for infrastructure 1. Activity status: Controlled Where: a. Subdivision is sought by a Network Utility Operator and b. Compliance is achieved with the following standards for any balance allotment: i. SUB-S1; and ii. ~~SUB-S6; and~~ SUB-S7.	Accept in part	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.62	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / General point on Subdivision / SUB-R4	Support	Supports provision for a network utility operator to undertake subdivision as a controlled activity, subject to standards. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow	Accept	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.193	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R4	Support	SUB-R4 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R4 (Subdivision to create a new allotment for infrastructure) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.225	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R4	Support in part	SUB-R4 is partially supported, with the expectation that it may be amended to fit with other proposed requirements. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain SUB-R2 (Subdivision to create a new allotment for infrastructure), with conditional amendment. [Refer to original submission]	Accept in part	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.11	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R4	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.266	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R4	Support	Supports SUB-R4.	Retain SUB-R4 (Subdivision to create a new allotment for infrastructure) as notified.	N/A	No
Wellington City Council	266.103	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R5	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of discretion from rule SUB-R5.2.7 (Subdivision that creates any vacant allotment) and 5.3.4 as follows: ~~Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary~~	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.111	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R5	Support	Supports the rule subject to the relief sought regarding SUB-S1 and SUB-S2, which will ensure water supply and access matters are sufficiently addressed for all new allotments as both a permitted and controlled activity. Further, matters of control consider SUB-P7. FENZ considers this will help ensure the safety and wellbeing of life, property, and the environment in relation to fire risk.	Retain SUB-R5 (Subdivision that creates any vacant allotment) as notified.	N/A	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.194	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R5	Support	SUB-R5 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R5 (Subdivision that creates any vacant allotment) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.226	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R5	Support in part	SUB-R5 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought to require a minimum shape standard for vacant lot subdivision to manage the creation of lot sizes that do not support the outcomes of the underlying zone.	Retain SUB-R5 (Subdivision that creates any vacant allotment), with amendment.	Reject	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.12	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R5	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.227	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R5	Amend	Considers that SUB-R5 should be amended so that the Discretionary Activity status is given when minimum lot size and shape standards are not met. This activity status is considered appropriate as vacant lot subdivision that does not meet proposed minimum lot size and shape should not be anticipated within the zone. A minimum shape standard should be provided for vacant lot subdivision to manage the creation of lot sizes that do not support the outcomes of the underlying zone. Proposed minimum lot size and shape are sought through amendments to SUB-S6.	Amend SUB-R5.4 (Subdivision that creates any vacant allotment) as follows: 4. Activity Status: Discretionary where: a. The subdivision is not a controlled activity under SUB-R5.1 or a restricted discretionary activity under SUB-R5.2 or SUB-R5.3. ; b. <u>Compliance with SUB-S6 is not achieved.</u>	Accept	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.13	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R5	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.30	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R5	Support	Supports SUB-R5.	Retain as notified.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.112	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R6	Amend	Supports the rule as it restricts subdivision of land. However, FENZ considers SUB-R6 does not provide appropriate consideration for the provision of services, particularly firefighting water supply and access to that supply. As such, FENZ seeks an amendment to SUB-R6 to provide Council with the discretion to consider these matters.	Support SUB-R6 (Subdivision of land within a site or area of significance to Māori Category A and B), with amendment.	Accept	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.113	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R6	Amend	Supports the rule as it restricts subdivision of land. However, FENZ considers SUB-R6 does not provide appropriate consideration for the provision of services, particularly firefighting water supply and access to that supply. As such, FENZ seeks an amendment to SUB-R6 to provide Council with the discretion to consider these matters.	Amend SUB-R6 (Subdivision of land within a site or area of significance to Māori Category A and B) as follows: Matters of discretion: … 1. The matters in SUB-P9~~.~~; and 2. The extent to which firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, has been provided in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.195	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R6	Support	SUB-R6 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R6 (Subdivision of land within a site or area of significance to Māori Category A and B) as notified.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.196	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R7	Support	SUB-R7 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R7 (Subdivision of a site on which a scheduled heritage building or object is located) as notified.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.197	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R8	Support	SUB-R8 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R8 (Subdivision of a site within a heritage area) as notified.	Accept in part	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.198	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R9	Support	SUB-R9 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R9 (Subdivision of a site on which a scheduled archaeological site is located) as notified.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.199	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R10	Support	SUB-R10 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R10 (Subdivision of a site on which a notable tree is located) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.114	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R11	Support in part	Supports the rule as it restricts subdivision of land within a significant natural area. However, FENZ considers there is generally a heightened fire risk in more rural / vegetated areas, which is increasing overtime due to the effects of climate change. As such, FENZ considers it important that subdivisions within a significant natural area are provided with a sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Supports SUB-R11 (Subdivision of land within a significant natural area), with amendment.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.115	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R11	Amend	Supports the rule as it restricts subdivision of land within a significant natural area. However, FENZ considers there is generally a heightened fire risk in more rural / vegetated areas, which is increasing overtime due to the effects of climate change. As such, FENZ considers it important that subdivisions within a significant natural area are provided with a sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Amend SUB-R11 (Subdivision of land within a significant natural area) as follows: Matters of discretion: 1. The matters in SUB-P15 and 16624,SUB-P16.~~;~~ and 2. The extent to which firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, has been provided in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.284	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R11	Support in part	Supports the requirement that the building platform be located outside the SNA for the RDA rule to apply. The RDA rule should also only apply where access to the building platform is also outside the SNA. The matters of discretion should be expanded to include ECO XX (re maintenance of biodiversity) and ECO P5, or their replicas in the SUB chapter (as sought above). Where the RDA requirements are not met, the activity should become non-complying	Amend SUB-R11 (Subdivision of land within a significant natural area): 1.Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. A future building platform to contain a residential unit is identified for each new undeveloped allotment that: i. Complies with the underlying zone provisions for buildings; and ii. Is located outside of the significant natural area. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in SUB-P15 and 16624, SUB-P16. 2. The matters in ECO-P5 and ECO-PX (re: maintenance of biodiversity). … 2. Activity status: ~~Discretionary~~ Non-complying	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.200	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R11	Support	SUB-R11 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R11 (Subdivision of land within a significant natural area) as notified.	Accept	No
Director-General of Conservation	385.55	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R11	Support	Supports proposed Rule SUB-R11 (Subdivision of land within a significant natural area).	Retain rule SUB-R11 (Subdivision of land within a significant natural area) as notified.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.116	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R12	Support in part	Supports the rule as it restricts subdivision of land within a significant natural area. However, FENZ considers there is generally a heightened fire risk in more rural / vegetated areas, which is increasing overtime due to the effects of climate change. As such, FENZ considers it important that subdivisions within a significant natural area are provided with a sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Support SUB-R12 (Subdivision of land within significant amenity landscapes), with amendment.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.117	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R12	Amend	Supports the rule as it restricts subdivision of land within a significant natural area. However, FENZ considers there is generally a heightened fire risk in more rural / vegetated areas, which is increasing overtime due to the effects of climate change. As such, FENZ considers it important that subdivisions within a significant natural area are provided with a sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Amend SUB-R12 (Subdivision of land within significant amenity landscapes) as follows: Matters of discretion: 1. The effects on the identified values of the special amenity landscape~~; and~~. 2. The matters in SUB-P18~~.~~; and 3. The extent to which firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, has been provided in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008	Accept in part	Yes
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.285	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R12	Support in part	Supports RD in SALs but seek that the matters of discretion be expanded to include NFL-P3 and NFL-P4 and cross reference new ECO and NFL policies sought above which are aimed at the maintenance of biodiversity outside of SNAs as well as ensuring policy 11 of the NZCPS is given effect to, outside of SNAs. Oppose the use of "identified" values as per our submission on SCHED11. Support discretionary status in 2.	Amend SUB-R12 (Subdivision of land within special amenity landscapes): 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. A future building platform to contain a residential unit is identified for each new undeveloped allotment that: i. complies with the underlying zone provisions for buildings. Matters of discretion are: 1. The effects on the ~~identified~~ values of the special amenity landscape; and 2. The matters in SUB-P18 3. The matters in NFL-P3, NFL-P4 [and ECO and NFL policies for maintenance of biodiversity outside SNAs and giving effect to Policy 11 of NZ Coastal Policy Statement]	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.201	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R12	Support	SUB-R12 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R12 (Subdivision of land within special amenity landscapes) as notified.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.118	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R13	Support in part	Supports the rule as it restricts subdivision of land within a significant natural area. However, FENZ considers there is generally a heightened fire risk in more rural / vegetated areas, which is increasing overtime due to the effects of climate change. As such, FENZ considers it important that subdivisions within a significant natural area are provided with a sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Retain SUB-R13 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes), with amendment.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.119	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R13	Amend	Supports the rule as it restricts subdivision of land within a significant natural area. However, FENZ considers there is generally a heightened fire risk in more rural / vegetated areas, which is increasing overtime due to the effects of climate change. As such, FENZ considers it important that subdivisions within a significant natural area are provided with a sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Amend SUB-R13 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes) as follows: Matters of discretion: 1. The matters in SUB-P19 and SUB-P20~~; and~~. 2. The effects on the identified values of the outstanding natural features or landscapes.~~;~~ and 3. The extent to which firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, has been provided in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.286	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R13	Support in part	Supports the requirement that the future building platform is located outside of the outstanding natural feature or landscape. Considers this should be extended to also require that the access to the building platform is outside of the ONFL as well. Seeks that the matters of discretion for RDA refer to policies aimed at protecting ONFLs and the indigenous biodiversity located within them, including new ECO and NFL policies sought by F&B which are aimed at the maintenance of biodiversity outside of SNAs. Support Discretionary and Non-Complying status.	Amend SUB-R13 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes): 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. A future building platform to contain a residential unit and access is identified for each new undeveloped allotment that: i. complies with the underlying zone provisions for buildings; and ii. is located outside of the outstanding natural feature or landscape. Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The matters in SUB-P19 and SUB-P20; and 2. The effects on the identified values of the outstanding natural features or landscapes. 3. [Insert ECO and NFL policies for maintenance of biodiversity outside SNAs]	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.202	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R13	Support	SUB-R13 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R13 (Subdivision of land within outstanding natural features and landscapes) as notified.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.120	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R14	Support in part	Supports the rule s it restricts the subdivision of land within Coastal Environment, Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays. FENZ seeks an additional matter of discretion requiring sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Supports SUB-R14 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment outside of high coastal natural character areas and outside of coastal margins and riparian margins), with amendment.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.121	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R14	Amend	Supports the rule s it restricts the subdivision of land within Coastal Environment, Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays. FENZ seeks an additional matter of discretion requiring sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Amend SUB-R14 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment outside of high coastal natural character areas and outside of coastal margins and riparian margins) as follows: Matters of discretion: 1. The matters in PA-P1, SUB-P8 and SUB-P21~~.~~; and 2. The extent to which firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, has been provided in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.287	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R14	Oppose in part	Considers that provisions which only protect areas of high natural character do not give effect to NZCPS policy 13. As such, we oppose the controlled rule, which would not allow the Council the ability to decline consent where there were significant adverse effects. In that context, RD is more appropriate. Ensure that the matters of discretion refer to policies aimed at protecting natural character, not only those concerning esplanade strips (SUB P8) and urban sprawl (SUB P21)	Amend SUB-R14 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment outside of high coastal natural character areas and outside of coastal margins and riparian margins): 1. Activity status: ~~Controlled~~ Restricted Discretionary Where: a. The subdivision is not located in any Open Space and Recreation Zone or the General Rural Zone; and b. Compliance is achieved with the following standards: i. SUB-S6; and ii. SUB-S7. Matters of ~~control~~ discretion are: The matters in PA-P1, SUB-P8 and SUB-P21, and [insert references to policies that protect natural character]	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.203	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R14	Support	SUB-R14 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R14 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment outside of high coastal natural character areas and outside of coastal margins and riparian margins) as notified.	Accept	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.122	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R15	Support in part	Supports the rule s it restricts the subdivision of land within Coastal Environment, Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays. FENZ seeks an additional matter of discretion requiring sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Supports SUB-R15 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within coastal margins or riparian margins), with amendment.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.123	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R15	Amend	Supports the rule s it restricts the subdivision of land within Coastal Environment, Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays. FENZ seeks an additional matter of discretion requiring sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Amend SUB-R15 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within coastal margins or riparian margins) as follows: Matters of discretion: 2. Any measures proposed to protect the natural character values of the area, including the location and size of future building platforms~~; and~~. 3. The matters in SUB-P14, SUB-P21, SUB-P24, PA-P1, PA-P2 and PA-P3.~~;~~ and 4. The extent to which firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, has been provided in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.288	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R15	Oppose in part	Opposes controlled status for this activity. As submitted in the Coastal Environment chapter, the requirement to protect natural character applies regardless of zoning. Ensure that the matters of discretion for the RDA refer to policies aimed at protecting natural character.	Amend SUB-R15 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within coastal margins or riparian margins): 1. Activity status: ~~Controlled~~ Restricted Discretionary ~~Where:~~ ~~The subdivision is located in the Port Zone, Airport Zone, Stadium Zone, Waterfront Zone or City Centre Zone~~ Matters of ~~control~~ discretion are: 1. The effect on coastal margins and riparian margins; 2. Any measures proposed to protect the natural character values of the area, including the location and size of future building platforms; and 3. The matters in SUB-P14, SUB-P21, SUB-P23, PA-P1, PA-P2 and PA-P3, and [insert references to policies that protect natural character].	Accept in part	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.204	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R15	Support	SUB-R15 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R15 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within coastal margins or riparian margins) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Director-General of Conservation	385.56	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R15	Support	Supports proposed Rule SUB-R15 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within coastal margins or riparian margins).	Retain rule SUB-R15 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within coastal margins or riparian margins) as notified.	Accept in part	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.124	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R16	Support in part	Supports the rule s it restricts the subdivision of land within Coastal Environment, Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays. FENZ seeks an additional matter of discretion requiring sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Supports SUB-R16 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within high coastal natural character areas), with amendment.	Accept	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.125	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R16	Amend	Supports the rule s it restricts the subdivision of land within Coastal Environment, Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays. FENZ seeks an additional matter of discretion requiring sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Amend SUB-R16 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within high coastal natural character areas) as follows: Matters of discretion: 2. Any measures proposed to protect the natural character values of the area, including the location and size of future building platforms; and. 3. The matters in SUB-P14, SUB-P21, SUB-P22, PA-P1, PA-P2 and PA-P3.; and 4. The extent to which firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, has been provided in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.289	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R16	Support in part	Supports the requirement that the building platform is outside the high natural character area. Considers this should be extended to also require that the access to the building platform is outside the high natural character area. Also seeks that this rule is extended to apply to all areas of natural character in the coastal environment. Considers matters of discretion must refer to policies aimed at the protection of natural character. Supports non-complying status.	Amend SUB-R16 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment ~~within high coastal natural character areas~~): Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: A future building platform to contain a residential unit and an access is identified for each new undeveloped allotment that: complies with the underlying zone provisions for buildings; and is located outside of the high coastal natural character area. Matters of discretion are: 1. The effects on the identified coastal natural character values; 2. Any measures proposed to protect the natural character values of the area, including the location and size of future building platforms; and 3. The matters in SUB-P14, SUB-P21, SUB-P22, PA-P1, PA-P2 and PA-P3 and [insert references to policies that protect natural character].	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.205	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R16	Support	SUB-R16 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R16 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within high coastal natural character areas) as notified.	Reject	No
Director-General of Conservation	385.57	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R16	Support	Supports proposed Rule SUB-R16 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within high coastal natural character areas).	Retain rule SUB-R16 (Subdivision of land within the coastal environment within high coastal natural character areas) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.104	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of control/discretion from rule SUB-R17.2.3 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for less hazard sensitive activities within the low, medium or high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) and 17.1.3 as follows: ~~Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary~~	Accept in part	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.126	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Amend	Supports the rule s it restricts the subdivision of land within Coastal Environment, Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays. FENZ seeks an additional matter of discretion requiring sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Supports SUB-R17 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for less hazard sensitive activities within the low, medium, or high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault, or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) with amendment.	N/A	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.127	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Amend	Supports the rule s it restricts the subdivision of land within Coastal Environment, Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays. FENZ seeks an additional matter of discretion requiring sufficient firefighting water supply, including access to that supply, to be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008. FENZ considers this should apply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas.	Amend SUB-R17 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for less hazard sensitive activities within the low, medium, or high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault, or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) as follows: Matters of discretion: 2. Site access and the design of any vehicle parking and associated manoeuvring areas proposed~~; and~~. 3. Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary.; and 4. The extent to which firefighting water supply, and access to that supply, has been provided in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.188	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Amend	Considers where the activity does not comply with Rule SUB-R17.1.b, i.e. the building platform is within a stream corridor, a non-complying activity status is more appropriate instead of discretionary as proposed in the notified rule. Non-complying activity status allows full scrutiny of the application as part of the consent process and sends a message to applicants that consents generally will not be granted.	Amend SUB-R17.1 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for less hazard sensitive activities within the low, medium or high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity status: ~~Controlled~~ Non-Complying ...	Accept in part	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.206	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Support	SUB-R17 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R17 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for less hazard sensitive activities within the low...) as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.228	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Oppose in part	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Opposes in part SUB-R17 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for less hazard sensitive activities within the low, medium or high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) and seeks amendment.	N/A	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.14	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.59	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.229	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Amend	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Amend SUB-R17 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for less hazard sensitive activities within the low, medium or high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity status: Controlled where: a. The building platform is not located within an identified overland flowpath ~~of the Flood Hazard Overlay~~; and/or b. The building platform is not located within a stream corridor ~~of the Flood Hazard Overlay.~~ Matters of control are: ... ~~3. Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary~~. 2. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary ... ~~3. Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary; and~~	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.57	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory maps opens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of this submission regarding the flood hazard overlay be disallowed.	Accept	Yes
Hilary Watson	FS74.15	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.60	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.267	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Oppose	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R17 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for less hazard sensitive activities within the low, medium or high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.268	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R17	Amend	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R17 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for less hazard sensitive activities within the low, medium or high hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays or within the Flood Hazard, Liquefaction, Wellington Fault, Ohariu Fault, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.105	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of control from rule SUB-R18.1.1c (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay, or within the Liquefaction, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) as follows: ~~Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary~~	N/A	No
Poneke Architects	292.3	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Oppose	Opposes the Coastal Environment provisions in relation to subdivision as these are too broad and will effectively stop development in Wellington.	Delete references to the Coastal Environment in SUB-R18 (Subdivision of land in special amenity landscapes). [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.189	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Amend	Considers it is appropriate to require resource consent for subdivisions that create building platforms associated with potentially hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay. However, the activity status should be restricted discretionary, not controlled. Restricted discretionary activity status gives Council the ability to decline an application if it is considered inappropriate or the mitigation measures are inadequate. The matter listed under SUB-R18 (2) is considered appropriate for restricted activity status.	Amend SUB-R18. (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay, or within the Liquefaction, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity status: Controlled <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> ...	Accept in part	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.207	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Support	SUB-R18 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R18 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the low...) as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.230	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Oppose in part	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Opposes in part SUB-R18 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay, or within the Liquefaction, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) and seeks amendments.	N/A	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.16	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.61	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Accept	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.231	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Amend	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Seeks amendments to SUB-R18 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays, or within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay, or within the Liquefaction, Sheppards Fault or Terawhiti Fault Overlays) to remove the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Accept in part	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.58	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory maps opens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of this submission regarding the flood hazard overlay be disallowed.	Accept in part	Yes
Hilary Watson	FS74.17	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	N/A	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.62	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R18	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.106	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of control from rule SUB-R19.1.3 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: ~~Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary~~	Accept in part	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.208	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Support	SUB-R19 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R19 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as notified.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.232	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Oppose in part	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Opposes in part SUB-R19 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendment. to remove the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	N/A	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.18	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.63	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.233	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Amend	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Seeks amendment to SUB-R19 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) to remove the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.59	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory maps opens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of this submission regarding the flood hazard overlay be disallowed.	Accept	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.19	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.64	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.269	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Oppose	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R19 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.270	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R19	Amend	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R19 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the medium hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.209	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R20	Support	SUB-R20 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R20 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within overland flow...) as notified.	N/A	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.271	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R20	Oppose	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R20 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within overland flow path of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the Wellington Fault Overlay or the Ohariu Fault Overlay) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.272	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R20	Amend	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R20 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within overland flow path of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the Wellington Fault Overlay or the Ohariu Fault Overlay) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.210	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R21	Support	SUB-R21 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R21 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood...) as notified.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.234	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R21	Oppose in part	SUB-R21 is opposed as it would prevent subdivision for residential activities in existing urban areas subject to coastal hazards such as Kilbirnie. An amendment is sought to change the activity status to Discretionary to allow for the potential for managing the hazard risk for residential activities. The reference to the 'Flood Hazard Overlays' is also opposed.	Opposes in part SUB-R21 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendment.	N/A	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.20	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R21	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.81	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R21	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the suggested change in activity status as this would not have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Disallow / Seeks that SUB-R21 and SUB-R25 are retained as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.235	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R21	Amend	Considers that SUB-R21 should be amended, as it would prevent subdivision for residential activities in existing urban areas subject to coastal hazards such as Kilbirnie. Amendments to change the activity status to Discretionary to allow for the potential for managing the hazard risk for residential activities. Amendments are also sought to remove the reference to flood hazard overlays in the District Plan and to remove the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary'	Amend SUB-R21 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor ~~of the Flood Hazard Overlay~~ or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays 1. Activity Status: ~~Non-Complying~~ Discretionary	Accept	Yes
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.60	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R21	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the stream corridor of the flood hazard overlay and high coastal hazard overlay should remain non-compliant. Unimpeded stream corridors are important in allowing floodwater to escape and recede. Additionally, coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise. Amending this to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people at risk from flood hazard and may worsen the effects of flooding in the surrounding area, and expose more people to increasing coastal hazard risk.	Disallow / Seeks that the parts of this submission regarding the flood hazard overlay and coastal hazard overlay be disallowed.	Accept in part	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.21	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R21	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.273	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R21	Oppose	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R21 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.	N/A	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.274	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R21	Amend	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R21 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for potentially hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.107	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of control from rule SUB-R22.1.3 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive areas within the Sheppards Fault, Terawhiti Fault or Liquefaction Overlays) as follows: ~~Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary~~	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.211	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Support	SUB-R22 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R22 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive areas within the Sheppards Fault, Terawhiti Fault or Liquefaction Overlays) as notified.	Accept in part	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.236	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Oppose in part	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Opposes in part SUB-R22 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive areas within the Sheppards Fault, Terawhiti Fault or Liquefaction Overlays) and seeks amendment.	N/A	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.22	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.65	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.76	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Oppose	The submitter opposes flood hazard overlays and seeks for flood hazard overlays to be removed from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose the removal of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around what areas could be affected by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards – what land uses are appropriate to allow and disallow for.	Disallow	Accept	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.237	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Amend	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Amend SUB-R22 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive areas within the Sheppards Fault, Terawhiti Fault or Liquefaction Overlays) as follows: 1. Activity status: Controlled … ~~3. Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary.~~ [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	Yes
Hilary Watson	FS74.23	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Accept in part	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.66	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Accept in part	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.77	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R22	Oppose	The submitter opposes flood hazard overlays and seeks for flood hazard overlays to be removed from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose the removal of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around what areas could be affected by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards – what land uses are appropriate to allow and disallow for.	Disallow	N/A	No
Wellington City Council	266.108	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of discretion from rule SUB-R23.1.3 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: ~~Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary~~	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.190	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Amend	Considers the policies listed in matter of discretion 1 should include Policy SUB-P25	Amend SUB-R23 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays)to include SUB-P25 (Subdivision of land affected by natural hazards) as a matter of discretion.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.212	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Support	SUB-R23 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R23 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area...) as notified.	Accept	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.238	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Oppose in part	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Opposes in part SUB-R23 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendment.	Accept	No
Hilary Watson	FS74.24	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Oppose	Hilary Watson considers that these points are about removing character precincts from the plan. The precincts are important to protecting and preserving Wellington's townscape and sense of place, and can be retained and increased while still allowing enough realisable development capacity. Hillary Watson support the Council using Character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters under NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Disallow	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.67	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.78	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Oppose	The submitter opposes flood hazard overlays and seeks for flood hazard overlays to be removed from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose the removal of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around what areas could be affected by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards – what land uses are appropriate to allow and disallow for.	Disallow	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.239	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Amend	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Amend SUB-R23 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area of ~~the~~ Flood Hazard ~~Overlay~~ or the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays 1. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary … ~~3. Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary.~~ 4.The matters in NH-P6 for building platforms that are located in the inundation area ~~of the Flood Hazard Overlay;~~ and … [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.61	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Oppose	Accurate and risk-based regulatory hazard maps are an important tool in the WCC Proposed District Plan to limit subdivision and development within areas subject to natural hazard risk. Removing part or all of these regulatory maps opens the possibility that rules controlling development in flood-prone areas will be inconsistently applied, exposing people and their properties to unnecessary flood risk.	Disallow / Toka Tū Ake EQC seeks that the part of this submission regarding the flood hazard overlay be disallowed.	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.68	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Accept in part	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.79	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Oppose	The submitter opposes flood hazard overlays and seeks for flood hazard overlays to be removed from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose the removal of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around what areas could be affected by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards – what land uses are appropriate to allow and disallow for.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.275	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Oppose	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R23 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.276	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R23	Amend	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R23 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the inundation area of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the low hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.213	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R24	Support	SUB-R24 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R24 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within an overland flow path of the Flood Hazard Overlay) as notified.	Accept	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.240	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R24	Oppose in part	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Opposes in part SUB-R24 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within an overland flow path of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the medium hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendment.	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.69	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R24	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.80	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R24	Oppose	The submitter opposes flood hazard overlays and seeks for flood hazard overlays to be removed from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose the removal of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around what areas could be affected by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards – what land uses are appropriate to allow and disallow for.	Disallow	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.241	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R24	Amend	Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays and the reference to 'Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Amend SUB-R24 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within an overland flow path of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the medium hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within an overland flow path ~~of the Flood Hazard Overlay~~ or the medium hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.70	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R24	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a non-statutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.81	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R24	Oppose	The submitter opposes flood hazard overlays and seeks for flood hazard overlays to be removed from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose the removal of flood hazard overlays because these overlays provide certainty around what areas could be affected by hazards and how to plan for natural hazards – what land uses are appropriate to allow and disallow for.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.277	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R24	Oppose	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R24 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within an overland flow path of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the medium hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.278	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R24	Amend	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R24 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within an overland flow path of the Flood Hazard Overlay or the medium hazard areas of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.214	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R25	Support	SUB-R25 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R25 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay...) as notified.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.242	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R25	Oppose in part	SUB-R25 is opposed as it would prevent subdivision for residential activities in existing urban areas subject to coastal hazards such as Kilbirnie. Amendments to change the activity status to Discretionary to allow for the potential for managing the hazard risk for residential activities are sought. Opposes the inclusion of flood hazard overlays in the District Plan and District Plan maps and seeks all rules and standards remove the reference to the overlays and instead refer to the relevant hazard.	Opposes SUB-R25 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the Wellington Fault Overlay, the Ohariu Fault Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) and seeks amendments.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.82	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R25	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose the suggested change in activity status as this would not have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Disallow / Seeks that SUB-R21 and SUB-R25 are retained as notified.	Accept	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.243	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R25	Amend	Considers that SUB-R25 should be amended, as it would prevent subdivision for residential activities in existing urban areas subject to coastal hazards such as Kilbirnie. Amendments to change the activity status to Discretionary to allow for the potential for managing the hazard risk for residential activities. Amendments are also sought to remove the reference to flood hazard overlays in the District Plan and District Plan.	Amend SUB-R25 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the Wellington Fault Overlay, the Ohariu Fault Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) as follows: Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor ~~of the Flood Hazard Overlay~~, the Wellington Fault Overlay, the Ohariu Fault Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays 1. Activity Status: ~~Non-Complying~~ Discretionary [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No
Toka Tū Ake EQC	FS70.62	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R25	Oppose	Hazard sensitive activities, which include emergency facilities, hospitals, major hazardous facilities and childcare, within the stream corridor of the flood hazard overlay, high coastal hazard overlay, and the Wellington and Ohariu Fault overlays should remain non-compliant for the following reasons: - Unimpeded stream corridors are important in allowing floodwater to escape and recede. - coastal hazard risk is going to increase in the near future with the impact of climate change and sea level rise, and - Rupture of the Wellington or Ohariu fault is the natural hazard which will create the most devastating impact on Wellington City. While ground shaking can't be 'planned' for (but built for), the amount of damage can be reduced by not locating buildings on the faults. Therefore the fault overlays need to be retained to avoid building on the faults. Amending hazard sensitive activities in these overlays to discretionary provides a path for development which puts more people at risk from flood hazard and may worsen the effects of flooding in the surrounding area, exposes more people and properties to increasing coastal hazard risk, and exposes more people and properties to fault rupture. This is unacceptable even within already developed suburbs.	Disallow	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.279	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R25	Oppose	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R25 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the Wellington Fault Overlay, the Ohariu Fault Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.	Accept	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.280	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R25	Amend	Opposes these provisions as it is not clear the circumstances where building platforms will be required to be identified as part of subdivision consent. This is inappropriate within the Airport Zone given the size of the land parcels and nature of the activities that are accommodated on site, even where the activity is for hazard sensitive or potentially hazard sensitive activities. [See paragraphs 4.76 to 4.80 in original submission for further detail.]	Seeks that SUB-R25 (Subdivision that creates building platforms for hazard sensitive activities within the stream corridor of the Flood Hazard Overlay, the Wellington Fault Overlay, the Ohariu Fault Overlay or the high hazard area of the Coastal Hazard Overlays) is amended to provide clarification around the requirement for building platforms, and provide that building platforms are not required at the time of subdivision within the Airport Zone.	Accept	No
Wellington City Council	266.109	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R26	Amend	Considers provisions relating to the consideration of 'any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary' gives too much discretion to the assessment of controlled and restricted discretionary activities.	Delete below matter of control/discretion from rule SUB-R26.1.3 (Subdivision within the Wellington Fault Overlay or medium or high coastal hazard areas on land occupied by City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as follows: ~~Any consent notices, covenants, easements or other legal instruments necessary~~	Accept	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.215	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R26	Support	SUB-R26 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R26 (Subdivision within the Wellington Fault Overlay or medium or high coastal hazard areas on land...) as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.281	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R26	Support in part	Supports this rule subject to the amendments sought to Policy CE-P20 of the Proposed Plan.	If amendments to CE-P20 in original submission are adopted: Retain SUB-R26 (Subdivision within the Wellington Fault Overlay or medium or high coastal hazard areas on land occupied by City Centre Zone or Airport, operation port activities, passenger port facilities and rail activities) as notified.	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.110	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R27	Oppose	Considers the 'National Grid substation buffer' has been removed and as such this rule is no longer relevant.	Seeks to delete SUB-R27 in its entirety. AND: consequential renumbering of SUB-R28 to SUBlR31.	Accept in part	No
Transpower New Zealand Limited	FS29.39	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R27	Support	The deletion of the rule is consistent with the relief sought in the Transpower submission and is therefore supported.	Allow	Accept	Yes
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.170	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R27	Oppose	Submitter is not supportive of the rule and will not be pursuing it through the PDP process, noting there is no supporting definition of the substation buffer area to direct where the rule applies.	Delete Rule SUB-R27 (Subdivision in the National Grid substation buffer) in its entirety.	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.216	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R27	Support	SUB-R27 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R27 (Subdivision in the National Grid substation buffer) as notified.	Accept in part	Yes
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.171	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R28	Amend	Considers that on the basis the National Grid is a qualifying matter, the subdivision rule SUB-R28 should be addressed as part of the ISPP process.	Seeks that, subject to other amendments sought by the submitter to SUB-R28 (Subdivision in the National Grid Subdivision corridor) the rule be included within the IPI and made subject to the ISPP process.	Accept in part	Yes
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.172	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R28	Support in part	Supports SUB-R28 on the basis the rule gives effect to Policy 10 and Policy 11 of the NPS-ET and provides for the outcomes sought in INF-P7 (noting Transpower is seeking amendment to the policy). In particular the activity status is supported and reflects the approach in other district plans across New Zealand. Considers a restricted discretionary activity status for subdivision provides an appropriate incentive and opportunity to design subdivision layouts that avoid building sites within the National Grid Yard. Considers that Subdivision is the most effective point at which to ensure future reverse sensitivity effects, maintenance access issues, and adverse effects of transmission lines (including amenity issues) are avoided. This can be achieved by designing subdivision layouts to properly accommodate transmission corridors (including, for example, through the creation of reserves and/or open space where buffer corridors are located). The default non-complying status is supported where the standards cannot be met and reflects the strong policy directive of the NPS-ET. Seeks the following amendments: - Amend clause 2. to provide clarity and certainty the consideration also applies to the support structures, noting that transmission lines are not defined in the PDP. - Amend clause 5. to provide further direction as to the matters to consider when considering vegetation planting. - Provide as a matter of discretion, the risk of electrical hazards (new clause 8.).	Retain SUB-R28 (Subdivision in the National Grid subdivision corridor), subject to amendment.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.173	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R28	Amend	Supports SUB-R28 on the basis the rule gives effect to Policy 10 and Policy 11 of the NPSET and provides for the outcomes sought in INF-P7 (noting Transpower is seeking amendment to the policy). In particular the activity status is supported and reflects the approach in other district plans across New Zealand. Considers a restricted discretionary activity status for subdivision provides an appropriate incentive and opportunity to design subdivision layouts that avoid building sites within the National Grid Yard. Considers that Subdivision is the most effective point at which to ensure future reverse sensitivity effects, maintenance access issues, and adverse effects of transmission lines (including amenity issues) are avoided. This can be achieved by designing subdivision layouts to properly accommodate transmission corridors (including, for example, through the creation of reserves and/or open space where buffer corridors are located). The default non-complying status is supported where the standards cannot be met and reflects the strong policy directive of the NPSET. Seeks the following amendments: - Amend clause 2. to provide clarity and certainty the consideration also applies to the support structures, noting that transmission lines are not defined in the PDP. - Amend clause 5. to provide further direction as to the matters to consider when considering vegetation planting. - Provide as a matter of discretion, the risk of electrical hazards (new clause 8.).	Amend SUB-R28 (Subdivision in the National Grid subdivision corridor) as follows: … Matters of discretion are: … 2. The provision for the on-going efficient operation, maintenance, development and upgrade of the National Grid, including the ability for continued reasonable access to existing transmission lines and support structures for maintenance, inspections and upgrading; … 5. The nature and location of any proposed vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of the National Grid, and how such landscaping will impact on the operation, maintenance, upgrade and development (including access) of the National Grid; 6. The outcome of any consultation with Transpower; and 7. The extent to which the design and layout of the subdivision demonstrates that a suitable building platform or platforms for a principal building or dwelling can be located outside of the National Grid Yard for each new allotment. 8. The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage. …	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.217	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R28	Support	SUB-R28 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R28 (Subdivision in the National Grid subdivision corridor) as notified.	Accept	No
Firstgas Limited	304.39	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R29	Amend	Considers that SUB-R29 should not have a Permitted Activity status. New subdivision, and future land use development enabled by subdivision, can adversely affect the safe, efficient and effective functioning of the Gas Transmission Network including above-ground stations. The Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor, as well as above ground related infrastructure has the ability to affect how subdivision and development takes place. A Restricted Discretionary Activity is considered more appropriate to manage the consultation outcomes sought as part of a matter of discretion (not control) by Council.	Delete SUB-R29.1 (Subdivision of land containing a Gas Transmission Pipeline corridor) in its entirety and replace with a new rule.	Accept in part	No
Firstgas Limited	304.40	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R29	Amend	Considers that SUB-R29 should be amended to ensure that it includes the subdivision of land containing and/or within 10m the Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor or subdivision of land within 30m of above ground related infrastructure. The rule should be amended so that the subdivision of land containing and/or within 10m of a Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor or within 30m of above ground related infrastructure can be appropriately managed New subdivision, and future land use development enabled by subdivision, can adversely affect the safe, efficient and effective functioning of the Gas Transmission Network including above-ground stations. The Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor, as well as above ground related infrastructure has the ability to affect how subdivision and development takes place.	Amend SUB-R29.1 (Subdivision of land containing a Gas Transmission Pipeline corridor) as follows: Subdivision of land containing and/or within 10m of a Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor or; Subdivision of land within 30m of above ground related infrastructure. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. The subdivision will not result in any building(s) (or any part of any building) or ~~sensitive~~ residential activities being located within 10m of the gas transmission pipeline corridor and/or within 30m of above ground related infrastructure; b. New allotment boundaries are outside of, and do not cross, the gas transmission pipeline corridor and/or within 30m of above ground related infrastructure; c. The layout of allotments, including the balance area, and any associated earthworks, maintains physical and practical access to the Gas Transmission Pipeline; and d. The subdivision is not located in any Residential Zone. Matters of control are: …. 4. The extent to which the subdivision design allows for activities to be setback from the Gas Transmission Network ~~pipeline~~; Gas Transmission Network ~~pipeline~~; 5. The nature and location of any vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of the Gas Transmission Network ~~pipeline~~; and Gas Transmission Network ~~pipeline~~; and 6. The outcome of any consultation with the owner and operator of the gas transmission pipeline.	Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.64	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R29	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the changes sought. It is unclear where the spatial application of this rule will apply and as such a cost benefit analysis cannot be undertaken. Kāinga Ora opposes the amendments and introduction of the rule.	Disallow	Accept in part	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.218	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R29	Support	SUB-R29 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R29 (Subdivision of land containing a Gas Transmission Pipeline corridor) as notified.	Reject	No
Firstgas Ltd	FS97.12	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R29	Oppose	Firstgas opposes this submission which seeks to retain Rule SUB-R29 as notified in relation to the subdivision of land containing a Gas Transmission Pipeline to align with Firstgas' original submission seeking to amend this rule. Firstgas is seeking to amend this rule so that it includes the subdivision of land containing or within 10m of a Gas Transmission Pipeline Corridor or subdivision of land within 30m of above ground infrastructure.	Disallow	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.219	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R30	Support	SUB-R30 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R30 (Subdivision with the Air Noise Boundary) as notified.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.282	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R30	Support in part	Supports the discretionary activity status for subdivision within the Air Noise Boundary, however, submits that this rule should also apply to the 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary. [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 in original submission for further detail.]	Retain SUB-R30 (Subdivision within the Air Noise Boundary) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.283	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R30	Amend	Supports the discretionary activity status for subdivision within the Air Noise Boundary, however, submits that this rule should also apply to the 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary. [See paragraphs 4.62 to 4.75 in original submission for further detail.]	Amend SUB-R30 (Subdivision within the Air Noise Boundary) as follows: SUB-R30 Subdivision within the Air Noise Boundary or 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary Activity Status: Discretionary Notification status: For a resource consent application made in respect of Rule SUB-R30, WIAL must be considered to be an affected person in accordance with Section 95E of the RMA.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.124	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R30	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the proposed amendment which would constrain urban development in a wide area. An assessment of affected parties should be determined on a case-by-case development dependent on the effects of the activity. A blanket notification requirement would result in unnecessary delays and constraints to development where adverse effects may already have been appropriately mitigated.	Disallow	Accept	No
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.75	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R30	Support	Support WIAL's submission for the reasons set out in WIAL's submission.	Allow	Accept in part	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.220	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R31	Support	SUB-R31 is supported as it gives effect to Subdivision objectives and policies.	Retain SUB-R31 (Any other subdivision) as notified.	Accept	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.128	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S1	Support in part	Supports standard as it requires allotments to have access to a formed legal road. However, FENZ requires vehicle access standards to help ensure accesses can accommodate a fire appliances. As per the feedback provided within the Infrastructure and Transport chapters, FENZ seeks an amendment to SUB-S1 to ensure sufficient access for firefighting appliances is provided to sites in unreticulated areas, or areas where the driveway exceeds hose run distances	Retain SUB-S1 (Access), with amendment.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.129	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S1	Amend	Supports standard as it requires allotments to have access to a formed legal road. However, FENZ requires vehicle access standards to help ensure accesses can accommodate a fire appliances. As per the feedback provided within the Infrastructure and Transport chapters, FENZ seeks an amendment to SUB-S1 to ensure sufficient access for firefighting appliances is provided to sites in unreticulated areas, or areas where the driveway exceeds hose run distances	Amend SUB-S1 (Access) as follows: Every allotment must have practical, physical and legal access directly to a formed legal road or by way of a registered right-of-way. Any access to a site located in an area where no fully reticulated water supply system is available, or having a length greater than 50 metres when connected to a road that has a fully reticulated water supply system including hydrants, must be designed to accommodate a fire appliance design vehicle of at least 2.5 metres wide and 13 metres long and with a minimum gross mass of 25 tonne including: a. a gradient of no more than 15% at any point; and b. a minimum clear passageway and/or vehicle crossing of at least 3.5 metres width at the site entrance, internal entrances and between buildings; and c. a minimum formed carriageway width of 4 metres; and d. a height clearance of at least 4 metres; and e. a design that is free of obstacles that could hinder access for emergency service vehicles; and f. The provision of hardstand and turnaround areas with maximum gradient of 5% in all directions.	Reject	No
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	FS116.5	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S1	Oppose	The requested changes for driveways longer than 50m are not consistent with Acceptable Solution C/AS1 Part 6 nor SNZ PAS 4509:2008. The requirements of SNZ PAS 4509:2008 are included as a matter of control under SUB-R1. Therefore, changes to SUB-S1 are not required	Disallow	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.198	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S1	Support in part	Supports with amendments, noted below.	Supports with amendment, noted below.	Reject	No
LIVE WELLington	FS96.92	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-O1	Oppose	More enabling than MDRS requirements without adequate justification.	Disallow	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.199	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S1	Amend	The Submitter seeks the addition of a note pertinent to this standard.	Amend SUB-S1 (Access) as follows: Every allotment must have practical, physical and legal access directly to a formed legal road or by way of a registered right-of-way. Note, please refer to the requirements of Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and Part IV of the Government Roading Powers Act 1989 with regard to vehicle entrances onto state highways.	Accept in part	No
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.31	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S1	Oppose	Considers that this standard requires discretion to be exercised by Council, which is not appropriate for a standard. Considers that this standard replicates S106(1)(c) of the RMA and is therefore an unnecessary duplication.	Delete SUB-S1 (Access).	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
AdamsonShaw	137.1	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S2	Amend	Considers that SUB-S2 should be clarified to refer to new *vacant* allotments. An allotment created around an existing dwelling (i.e.. not a vacant allotment) will not create an adverse effects on the existing water supply arrangement currently serving the existing house. Therefore, upgrades to the existing water supply arrangement (to meet current standards by Wellington Water Limited) cannot be required in the form of a condition of the subdivision consent as per Section 108AA(1)(b)(i) of the Resource Management Act. The existing water supply arrangement servicing the existing dwelling on the allotment (as long as the dwelling is to remain as part of the subdivision) can be retained in full.	Amend SUB-S2 (Water supply) to specifically refer to new vacant allotments.	Accept in part	Yes
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	FS116.6	Part 2 / Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S2	Support	Agree that where an existing house is retained on a new lot, that the existing water supply does not need to be replaced.	Allow	Reject	No
AdamsonShaw	137.2	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S2	Amend	Considers that SUB-S2 should be clarified to ensure that existing water supply arrangements continuing to serve an existing dwelling as part of the subdivision can be retained in full.	Amend SUB-S2 (Water supply) to add a point to ensure that existing water supply arrangements continuing to serve an existing dwelling as part of the subdivision can be retained in full.	Accept in part	no
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.130	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S2	Support in part	Strongly supports the standard as it requires all new lots to be serviced with reticulated water supply where available and, where this is not possible or sufficient, the provision of an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply must be provided. FENZ also supports reference to the firefighting Code of Practice specifically within the standards as it gives assurance that new lots as required will have ability to connect to an adequate firefighting water supply which is best considered before the development of any new buildings on the lot. It is also essential that FENZ personnel are able to access such supplies to utilise for firefighting purposes. The standards for the facilitation of such access are also contained within the Code of Practice. Specific reference to the necessity to provide access to water supply in accordance with the Code is therefore sought. FENZ supports the assessment criteria where the standard is infringed which includes the suitability of the proposed water supply for firefighting purposes, including effects on people's health and safety, and on property. Where this standard is infringed, it is considered necessary for FENZ to be consulted on any such applications.	Supports SUB-S2 (Water supply), with amendment.	Reject	No
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.131	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S2	Amend	Strongly supports the standard as it requires all new lots to be serviced with reticulated water supply where available and, where this is not possible or sufficient, the provision of an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply must be provided. FENZ also supports reference to the firefighting Code of Practice specifically within the standards as it gives assurance that new lots as required will have ability to connect to an adequate firefighting water supply which is best considered before the development of any new buildings on the lot. It is also essential that FENZ personnel are able to access such supplies to utilise for firefighting purposes. The standards for the facilitation of such access are also contained within the Code of Practice. Specific reference to the necessity to provide access to water supply in accordance with the Code is therefore sought. FENZ supports the assessment criteria where the standard is infringed which includes the suitability of the proposed water supply for firefighting purposes, including effects on people's health and safety, and on property. Where this standard is infringed, it is considered necessary for FENZ to be consulted on any such applications.	Amend SUB-S2 (Water supply) as follows: 1. Where a connection to Council's reticulated water supply systems is available, all new allotments must: a. Be provided with a water supply connection at the allotment boundary, that provides the level of service in Chapter 6, Tables 6.1 and 6.2 of the Wellington Water Regional Standard for Water Services May 2019; b. Comply with water supply requirements, including the requirements for access to such supply, in of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008; and 2. Where a connection to Council's reticulated water supply systems is not available, all allotments must: a. Be provided with access to a self-sufficient potable water supply with a minimum volume of 10,000L; and b. Comply with the water supply requirements, including the requirements for access to such supply, of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.	Accept	Yes
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.191	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S2	Amend	Considers that this would reduce the demand on reticulated water supplies, to have regard to Policies FW.2, FW.3, FW.5 and CC.14 42 (q) in Proposed RPS Change 1, and Policy 45 in the Operative RPS.	Amend SUB-S2 (Water supply) to require new lots connecting to the Council's water supply system to include alternate supplies for non-potable use, such as roofwater collection systems among other possible sources.	Reject	No
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.32	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S2	Amend	Considers that this rule makes the Regional Standard for Water Services 2021 a permitted activity standard. Therefore considers that the document (or specific relevant provisions) should be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan to allow submissions on the provisions, rather than being incorporated as a reference document. Considers that the consultation requirements of Schedule 1, Clause 34 of the RMA have therefore not been met. Considers that incorporating material by reference creates uncertainty for developers, as these documents can be amended by other entities (specifically Wellington Water) with no particular process. Notes that while there was some consultation, few issues were resolved. Notes that a District Plan change would be required to incorporate any new variations to the Regional Standard for Water Services 2021.	Amend SUB-S2 (Water supply): Remove reference to the Regional Standard for Water Services Add minimum requirements for new connections into the District Plan as required by the Regional Standard for Water Services.	Accept in part	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
AdamsonShaw	137.3	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S3	Amend	Considers that SUB-S3 should be clarified to refer to new *vacant* allotments. An allotment created around an existing dwelling (i.e.. not a vacant allotment) will not create an adverse effects on the existing wastewater system/connection currently serving the existing house. Therefore, upgrades to the existing wastewater system/connection (to meet current standards by Wellington Water Limited) cannot be required in the form of a condition of the subdivision consent as per Section 108AA(1)(b)(i) of the Resource Management Act. The existing wastewater system/connection servicing the existing dwelling on the allotment (as long as the dwelling is to remain as part of the subdivision) can be retained in full.	Amend SUB-S3 (Wastewater disposal) to specifically refer to new <u>vacant</u> allotments.	Accept	yes
AdamsonShaw	137.4	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S3	Amend	Considers that SUB-S3 should be clarified to ensure that existing wastewater system/connection continuing to serve an existing dwelling as part of the subdivision can be retained in full.	Amend SUB-S3 (Wastewater disposal) to add a point to ensure that existing wastewater system/connection continuing to serve an existing dwelling as part of the subdivision can be retained in full.	Accept in part	yes
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.192	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S3	Amend	Considers that the specific reference to septic tanks or soakage fields should be updated to refer to on-site domestic wastewater treatment and disposal.	Amend wording of SUB-S3 (Wastewater disposal) clause 2 as follows: Where a connection to Council's reticulated wastewater systems is not available, all allotments must be provided with <u>on-site wastewater systems</u> a ~~septic tank or soakage field~~ or an approved <u>alternative means to dispose of sewage in a sanitary manner</u>'.	Accept in part	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.193	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S3	Amend	Considers that the standard should provide for using approved alternative wastewater systems for decentralised wastewater re-use and treatment (of grey and black water) and disposal anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections aren't available. Providing for alternative wastewater treatment options aligns with recommendation 35 of Te Mahere Wai and gives effect to Te Mana o Te Wai. Alternative wastewater treatment options often reduce potable water use significantly. Reducing pressure of new development on the wastewater network may also make intensification in some areas with existing network capacity constraints more feasible. Relevant direction from the operative RPS includes policies 16 and 45. Relevant direction from Proposed RPS Change 1 includes policies FW.2, FW.3 and FW.5, CC.14 and 42(r), FW.5 and 58. Regional plan rules would apply to discharges from all wastewater systems to manage potential impacts on groundwater and surface water quality, aquatic ecosystems and soil health. These requirements could feasibly be met by approved alternative wastewater systems in both brownfield development and greenfield development.	Seeks that WCC provide for the possibility of de-centralised wastewater re-use and treatment (of grey and black water) and disposal using alternative approved wastewater systems anywhere where there are constraints on the existing network capacity, as well as where connections are not available. Where connections are available and there is network capacity, a connection to the wastewater network would still be required.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.194	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S3	Amend	Considers that this standard should refer to additional requirements for on-site wastewater discharge under the Natural Resources Plan.	Seeks to amend to refer to additional requirements for on-site wastewater discharge under the Natural Resources Plan.	Reject	No
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.33	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S3	Amend	Considers that this rule makes the Regional Standard for Water Services 2021 a permitted activity standard. Therefore considers that the document (or specific relevant provisions) should be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan to allow submissions on the provisions, rather than being incorporated as a reference document. Considers that the consultation requirements of Schedule 1, Clause 34 of the RMA have therefore not been met. Considers that many of the "level of service" items listed in the Standard are not appropriate to be standards for the District Plan. For example, the on-site disposal standards require Council to exercise discretion, which creates uncertainty.	Amend SUB-S3 (Wastewater disposal): Remove reference to the Regional Standard for Water Services Add minimum requirements for new connections into the District Plan as required by the Regional Standard for Water Services.	Reject	No
Rod Halliday	25.24	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Amend	Considers that SUB-S4 (Stormwater management) needs to have an exemption, or a permitted activity standard that does not require hydraulic neutrality for sites upstream of the Stebbings or Seton Nossiter detention structure that are designed to hold back the 1 in 100 year storm event.	Seeks that an exemption be added in SUB-S4 (Stormwater management), point 2, where allotments should not be required to achieve hydraulic neutrality if they are located within the Stebbings or Seton Nossiter stormwater catchments.	Reject	No
Heidi Snelson	FS24.8	Part 2 / Subdivision Chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Oppose	Submitter is seeking to reduce mitigation requirements and responsibilities around hydraulic neutrality and permeable surface requirements in the case of storm water management at an unprecedented time of storm water damage in Wellington. Developments should undertake more mitigation not less in all areas given climate change. Especially those posing more risk, such as steep hillsides, abutting/above key infrastructure (roading, power, water, railway), and significant streams, such as at the sites of the current and planned developments in Churton Park and Glenside West. The Glenside West development area is downstream of both detention structures, on extremely steep hillsides, above Porirua Stream, directly above Middleton Road (State Highway 1 motorway detour route) and the North Island railway line (which runs alongside and over the Porirua Stream). This development area must be specifically required to achieve Hydraulic Neutrality. Be that through specific technological infrastructure in build design and water catchment, significant permeable surface requirements/planting. Through Large Lot Residential Only in Glenside West.	Disallow / Seeks that submission be disallowed to ensure strict adherence to hydraulic neutrality in Glenside West Development Area, and Stebbings Valley / Reedy Block Development Area. Seeks minimum standard of hydraulic neutrality required and corresponding requirement of high level of permeable surface mitigations. Seeks that Glenside West be designated Large Lot Residential only.	Accept in part	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
AdamsonShaw	137.5	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Amend	Considers that SUB-S4 should be clarified to refer to new *vacant* allotments. An allotment created around an existing dwelling (i.e.. not a vacant allotment) will not create an adverse effects on the existing stormwater system/connection currently serving the existing house. Therefore, upgrades to the existing stormwater system/connection (to meet current standards by Wellington Water Limited) cannot be required in the form of a condition of the subdivision consent as per Section 108AA(1)(b)(i) of the Resource Management Act. The existing stormwater system/connection servicing the existing dwelling on the allotment (as long as the dwelling is to remain as part of the subdivision) can be retained in full.	Amend SUB-S4 (Stormwater management) to specifically refer to new <u>vacant</u> allotments.	Accept	yes
AdamsonShaw	137.6	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Amend	Considers that SUB-S4 should be clarified to ensure that existing stormwater system/connection continuing to serve an existing dwelling as part of the subdivision can be retained in full.	Amend SUB-S4 (Stormwater management) to add a point to ensure that existing stormwater system/connection continuing to serve an existing dwelling as part of the subdivision can be retained in full.	Accept in part	No
AdamsonShaw	137.7	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Amend	Considers that SUB-S4 should be clarified to reflect that subdivisions can involve creating allotments around existing dwellings. Allotments that contain existing dwellings do not need to be provided with hydraulic neutrality. This is because the dwelling existed prior to the subdivision and so the subdivision is not increasing the stormwater runoff on this allotment.	Amend SUB-S4.2 (Stormwater management) as follows: 2. All subdivisions <u>creating vacant allotments</u> must achieve hydraulic neutrality; and …	Accept	yes
AdamsonShaw	137.8	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Amend	Considers that SUB-S4 should be clarified to reflect that allotments that contain existing dwellings do not need to be provided with hydraulic neutrality.	Amend SUB-S4.2 (Stormwater management) to include a note pointing out that existing dwellings do not require hydraulic neutrality.	Accept in part	Yes
Trelissick Park Group	168.21	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Support	Supports that SUB-S4 (Stormwater management) covers stormwater hydraulic neutrality and water sensitive design.	Retain SUB-S4 (Stormwater management) as notified, with amendments below.	Reject	No
Trelissick Park Group	168.22	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Amend	Considers that it is essential that all building developments, including infill housing, require at least neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development, and so infringement provisions for stormwater should be deleted.	Amend SUB-S4 (Stormwater management) as follows: … ~~Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed:~~ ~~1. The extent to which the proposed stormwater management solution is sufficient for the development or activity it serves;~~ ~~2. The extent to which the proposed stormwater management solution results in adverse effects on peoples' health and safety;~~ ~~3. Whether the proposed stormwater management solution results in adverse flooding effects on other property, including on the effective function of Council's reticulated network;~~ ~~4. Where Council's reticulated system is not immediately available but is likely to be in the near future, the appropriateness of temporary systems; and~~ ~~5. Whether any site constraints make compliance impracticable.~~	Accept	No
Tyers Stream Group	221.70	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-R4	Support in part	Supports in part the provision of a connection to the water reticulation network except that it does not fund the upgrade needed for that network to cope with extra capacity required for the series of new subdivision.	Retain SUB-S4 (Stormwater management) with amendment.	Reject	No
Tyers Stream Group	221.71	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Amend	Considers that SUB-S4 is OK except that provision of a connection to the water reticulation network does not fund the upgrade needed for that network to cope with extra capacity required for the series of new subdivision.	Seeks amendment to SUB-S4 (Stormwater management) to require contributions from the subdivider to any upgrades, in proportion to the extent of upgrade required from the subdivision. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.195	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Amend	Considers these standards should refer to additional requirements for stormwater discharge under the Natural Resources Plan.	Seeks to amend to refer to additional requirements for stormwater discharge under the Natural Resources Plan.	Accept	No
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.34	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S4	Amend	Considers that this rule makes the Regional Standard for Water Services 2021 a permitted activity standard. Therefore considers that the document (or specific relevant provisions) should be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan to allow submissions on the provisions, rather than being incorporated as a reference document. Considers that the consultation requirements of Schedule 1, Clause 34 of the RMA have therefore not been met. In the Standard, Tables 4.1 of the Standard provides a design level of service for a 10% AEP. However, Tables 4.2 and 4.3 evaluate floor levels and flood depths/flows in public areas, which are not relevant to the provision of stormwater connection for a lot.	Amend SUB-S4 (Stormwater management): Remove reference to the Regional Standard for Water Services Add minimum requirements for new connections into the District Plan as required by the Regional Standard for Water Services.	Accept in part	No
Chorus New Zealand Limited	88.2	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S5	Support	The SUB-S5 is supported as it ensures that appropriate subdivision activities within the relevant zones have provision for fibre optic cables. This provision achieves an appropriate balance to ensure that all allotments created by any subdivision are adequately serviced by telecommunications in accordance with SUB-P7.	Retain SUB-S5 (Telecommunications and power supply) as notified.	Accept in part	Yes
Rod Halliday	25.25	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S6	Amend	Considers that the use of the phrase 'capable of providing a platform within the 'built' area' in SUB-S6.8 (Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area) is ambiguous and subject to misinterpretation. This development should be treated like 'All other Zones' .	Amend SUB-S6.8 (Number, size and shape of allotments - Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area) as follows: … Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Development Area 8. Minimum allotment size and shape: ~~Capable of providing a platform within the 'built' area~~ <u>nil</u> [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	IHP recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Glenside Progressive Association (GPA)	FS4.11	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S6	Oppose	Supports unbuilt areas marked in grey remaining as 'no build 'areas. Oppose any of these areas including the area marked in mustard/yellow (Fig 1 FS04) being used for medium density housing. Medium density housing would intrude into the hilltops and ridgelines, and any building platforms would require extensive earthworks causing sedimentation downstream and would fill existing deep gullies that contain and carry stormwater. Filling gullies for building platforms and roading is not sustainable watershed management and does not follow UN Sustainable Development Goals for addressing Climate Change. Council should ensure any proposed development for Glenside West promotes smarter water management and climate change adaptation solutions. Additionally, Council should protect the landscape as supported by the Boffa Miskell report ibid (2018): p 63). Refer to p 7-9 of this submission. Believe Council should discourage medium density housing on steep terrain as proposed for Glenside West and protect this landscape as supported by the Boffa Miskell (2018) report. [Refer to Further submission for full reason, including attachment] [Inferred reference to submission 25.25]	Amend / Seeks that: - The grey unbuilt area in Glenside West is unsuitable land for housing. - The whole area shown in mustard/yellow is limited to Large Lot Residential. - No housing is built above the current Glenside-Churton park suburb boundary in order that the ridgeline is offered at least some degree of visual protection.	Reject	No
Heidi Snelson	FS24.10	Part 2 / Subdivision Chapter/ Subdivision/ SUB-S6	Oppose	Submitter looks to remove and reduce requirements to keep development activities within 'built areas'. Submitter looks to remove need to adhere to defined limits around 'built area', 'non build' areas and activities. Submitter looks to undertake activities via their own discretion rather than those defined by the WCC/GWRC.	Disallow / Seeks requirements for discrete built areas and not allowing for "all other zone" considerations without defined limits.	Reject	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.244	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S6	Support in part	SUB-S6 is generally supported, but amendments are sought regarding the exclusion of minimum lot size requirements and limits as applied by this standard. [Submitter refers to SUB-R6 instead of SUB-S6]	Retain SUB-S6 (Number, size and shape of allotments) with amendment.	Accept in part	No
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.245	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S6	Amend	Considers that SUB-S6 should be amended to exclude minimum lot size requirements and limits as applied by this standard. However, considers that the minimum lot size in the Metropolitan Centre, Local Centre, Neighbourhood Centre, Mixed Use and General Industrial Zone should be nil as well. Applying a minimum lot size is considered inconsistent with SUB-O1, SUB-P1 and SUB-P5. It is also sought by the submitter that a minimum shape factor standard is added for vacant allotments, to match with SUB-R5. The matters of control that apply to the creation of a vacant allotment ensure appropriate consideration is given to the feasible development of all vacant allotments which is considered sufficient to ensure small, undevelopable lots do not result. The submitter also requests the deletion to any reference of legal instruments as a matter of assessment criteria for considering and determining consent applications.	Amend SUB-S6 (Number, size and shape of allotments) as follows: Number, size and shape of vacant allotments The following maximum vacant allotment number and minimum size and shape limits must be complied with for any fee simple subdivision: … Standard Limit …. Vacant Allotments Minimum allotment shape Accommodate a rectangle of 8m x 15m. Metropolitan Centre, Local Centre, Neighbourhood Centre, Mixed Use & General Industrial Zones 5. Maximum number of allotments nil 6. Minimum allotment size ~~500m2~~ nil 7. Minimum allotment shape nil Assessment Criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. The extent to which ~~a higher density of~~ development is compatible with the anticipated zone purpose, form and function ~~local site context~~; … ~~5. The effectiveness of any legal or instruments necessary to limit future intensification.~~ [Refer to original submission for table]	Accept in part	Yes
Rod Halliday	25.26	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S7	Amend	Considers that SUB-S7 (Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips) seems inappropriate to apply to large rural lots as this will see huge tracts of riparian areas lost. SUB-S7 should be reverted back to the way it was written in Rule 15.4.5 in the Operative District Plan, with only lots less than 4ha in the rural zone captured.	Seeks that SUB-S7 (Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips) only applies to lots smaller than 4ha in Rural Zones.	Reject	No
Rod Halliday	25.27	Subdivision chapter / Subdivision / SUB-S7	Amend	Considers that SUB-S7 (Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips) seems inappropriate to apply to large rural lots as this will see huge tracts of riparian areas lost. SUB-S7 should only be applicable to the following identified streams and tributaries, as stated in the Operative District Plan, Rule 15.4.5: - Porirua Stream and tributaries - Makara Stream and tributaries, including Ohariu Stream - Oteranga Stream and tributaries - Karori Stream and tributaries	Seeks that SUB-S7 (Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips) applies solely to the following streams and tributaries: - Porirua Stream and tributaries - Makara Stream and tributaries, including Ohariu Stream - Oteranga Stream and tributaries - Karori Stream and tributaries	Reject	No