

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.21	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Not specified	Considers that areas of open space are recognised as essential to human wellbeing. [Refer to original submission for details]	Seeks that alienated areas of the Wellington Town Belt are returned to enhance green space in light of the Housing Accord intensification plan.	Reject	No
James Coyle	307.24	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Not specified	Considers that the Town Belt is relied on too much for providing green areas and numbers may be skewed as a result. While the town belt is an asset it is not accessible to all.	Not specified.	Reject	No
James Coyle	307.25	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Amend	Considers that more parks and public spaces should be planned to do density well, similar to Carrara Park.	Seeks that more parks and public spaces be planned.	Reject	No
James Coyle	307.26	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that there are minimum walking distances to parks and public spaces based on density.	Reject	No
Carolyn Stephens	344.12	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should be amended to provide for the addition and extension of new green space to balance increased residential densities. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the extent of green spaces be increased.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.284	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Support in part	Supports the provision for customary practices in this zone.	Retain chapter, subject to amendments outlined in other submission points.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.285	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Amend	Considers the provisions of the Open Space Zones to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks to ensure the Open Space Zone provisions have regard to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1, by including necessary objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that provide for these qualities and characteristics.	Reject	No
Inner City Wellington	352.5	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Not specified	Considers that the plan may not be able to directly influence and improve Green Spaces.	Not specified.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Josephine Brien / Tim Bollinger	365.5	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Not specified	Considers that there are many further issues related to inner city greenery and its protection and extension, and to do with traffic management in the inner city urban area in the District Plan.	Not specified.		
						Reject	No
Elizabeth Nagel	368.17	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Amend	Considers that the plan should be amended to provide for the addition and extension of new green space to balance increased residential densities. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the extent of green spaces be increased.		
						Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.83	Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones / General point on Open Space and Recreation Zones	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Open Space Zone chapter objectives and policies be amended to recognise mana whenua values and aspirations as well as the kaitiakitanga role that Mana Whenua has over the whenua		
						Accept in part	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CUSTOMARY ACTIVITY	Support	Support the inclusion of customary activity in the definitions section, and the recognition it provides for Māori customary activities.	Retain the definition for 'customary activity' as notified.	Accept	No
Murray Martin	14.1	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / INFORMAL RECREATION ACTIVITIES	Amend	With specific regard to Owhiro Bay Parade, the concern is that if not amended, the current definition of 'informal recreation activities' means that the rule GRUZ - R5.2 prevails and vehicle access to Owhiro Bay Parade road/track becomes a Discretionary Activity. This opens the possibility of Council having exclusive access to this road/track, without public consultation on relevant access matters, which is not satisfactory to the user groups.	Amend "informal recreation" definition as follows:  Informal Recreation Activities: means a pastime, leisure, sport or exercise activity that occurs on an ad-hoc basis or irregularly and contributes to a person's enjoyment and/or relaxation. It excludes:  a. regular organised sport and recreation; and b. the use of motorised vehicles, <u>except on unformed legal roads</u> .	Accept in part	Yes
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.6	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RECREATION ACTIVITY	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Recreation Activity' should include campgrounds as a recreational activity as this could achieve their desired outcome of campgrounds being a permitted activity in the zones.	Amend the definition of 'Recreation Activity' to include campgrounds.	Reject	No
Amos Mann	172.9	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Considers that green space should be recreational, food producing, and support biodiversity. Community gardens and green stormwater infrastructure should maximise their value across all these outcomes.	Seeks that the District Plan supports the creation of a sustainable and resilient local food and biodiversity network system.	Reject	No
Alan Fairless	242.8	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the District Plan increase the extent of new green space.	Reject	No
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.6	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that there is opportunity to increase the range of open spaces for the public to enjoy.	Seeks that the extent of Open Space Zones be increased.	Reject	No
Panorama Property Limited	10.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Seeks that the land at 1 Upland Road is zoned MUZ not OSZ.  The commercial use of the buildings at 1 Upland Road is established and would be inconsistent with the purpose and policies of the OSZ in OSZ introduction, OSZ-O1, and OSZ-P3. The buildings are not used in a way that is ancillary to the Botanic Garden.  MUZ introduction, MUZ-O1 and MUZ-P2 better align with the established use of the buildings at 1 Upland Road.	Rezone 1 Upland Road from Open Space Zone to Mixed Use Zone or equivalent appropriate zone.	Accept in part	No
Wellington City Council	266.45	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the second access to St Gerards Monastery, Oriental Bay should be re-zoned from Open Space to MRZ. This is to match the zoning in the Operative District Plan. [shown in image in the full submission]	Seeks to re-zone second access to St Gerards Monastery, Oriental Bay should be re-zoned from Open Space Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.  [shown in image in full submission].	Accept	Yes
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.39	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.  Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.  The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial reality.  Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.  [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.	Reject	No
Wellington City Council	266.46	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers 39 Chapman Street, Johnsonville should be re-zoned from Open Space Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone to reflect the current residential use of the land.	Seeks to re-zone 39 Chapman Street, Johnsonville as shown in image supplied in full submission from OSZ (Open Space Zone) to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone).	Accept in part	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.40	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.</p> <p>Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.</p> <p>The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial reality.</p> <p>Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.	Reject	No
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.7	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Supports that the Horokiwi site is zoned Special Purpose Quarry Zone, however two sites are not included, and amendments are sought to rezone two areas (being Pt Sec 17 Harbour District and Pt Sect 18 Harbour District from General Rural zone to Special Purpose Quarry zone, and part of Pt Sec 16 Harbour District from Open Space zone to Special Purpose Quarry Zone). This would provide for the full utilisation of the quarry site and provide a more efficient consenting regime. Pt Sec 16 Harbour District is owned by Horokiwi Quarries Ltd, is included within the existing use certificate, and part of the site features the existing sediment pond. Public access within the site is restricted and the site has no passive or active recreational assets or activities. The land is not subject to a reserves management plan and other than its historical zoning, there appears no basis or justification for an Open Space Zoning in the PDP. A consistent zoning would therefore be logical and efficient.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]</p>	<p>Rezone Pt Sec 16 Harbour District from Open Space Zone to Special Purpose Quarry Zone.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for figures and attachments showing the area sought to be rezoned].</p>	Addressed in Hearing Stream 6	
Ross Judge	438.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Supports the rezoning of 39 Chapman Street from Open Space Zone to High Density Residential Zone. The 282m2 area is in the process of being purchased from the WCC and has already been surveyed prior to the sale. The site is intended for housing development in conjunction with the subdivision at the back of 15 Chesterton Street. The site would be within the same walking distance to the Johnsonville railway station and other public transport as other Chesterton Street and Chapman St properties that will be classified as HRZ.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Rezone 39 Chapman Street from Open Space Zone to High Density Residential Zone.	Accept	Yes
Jill Wilson	218.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	<p>Considers that the inner city lacks greenspace.</p> <p>Considers that the Green Network Plan should be a mandated component of green space and amenity planning for the city, with a transparent and integrated set of criteria, rather than being a non-statutory document.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the Green Network Plan become a statutory component of the Proposed District Plan.	Reject	No
Jill Wilson	218.2	Other / Other / Other	Amend	<p>Considers that green spaces in the City Centre should be designed for families and the people living in the area rather than lunchtime workers.</p>	Seeks that green spaces in the City Centre should be designed for families and the people living in the area rather than lunchtime workers. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Jim & Christine Seymour	262.2	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Considers the lack of play areas for young children and sporting facilities for older children.</p>	Seeks the addition of green spaces.	Reject	No
Ben Barrett	479.3	Other / Other / Other	Amend	<p>Considers that the Council should increase the percentage of green spaces in line with planned population density.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the Council will increase the percentage of green spaces in line with planned population density.	Reject	No
Ben Barrett	479.4	Other / Other / Other	Amend	<p>Considers that the Council improve the quality of the green spaces; (quiet, allow seats to capture sunshine hours, away from roads, connect us to nature/plants/water, include playgrounds for all ages).</p>	Seeks that the Council improve the quality of green spaces.	Reject	No
Craig Palmer	492.1	Other / Other / Other	Not specified	<p>Considers that more inner city parks and green space are needed in the CCZ.</p>	Seeks that more inner city paks and green spaces are created in the City Centre.	Reject	No
Cheryl Robilliard	409.1	Other / Other / Other	Support	<p>[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]</p>	Seeks the relief requested by the Newtown Residents' Association with respect to sunlight protection to parks and reserves.	Reject	No
James Coyle	307.27	Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones	Amend	<p>Considers that Carrara Park should be a "special zone" that is clearly hatched to protect sunlight access to the park in winter months.</p>	<p>Add new Special Purpose Zone for Carrara Park to protect the park's sunlight access in winter months.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	40.10	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Amend	The OSZ chapter has no provisions for the intermittent use of aircraft for agricultural aviation activities.	Seeks that the intermittent use of aircraft for agricultural aviation activities is included in the Proposed District Plan as permitted activity in the Open Space Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.70	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Not specified	Considers that the overlays (SAL) do not give effect to both the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone of the Proposed District Plan and National Policy Statement for Urban Development.  Considers that there is an opportunity to complete important public linkages to areas that the public value (Crows Nest and Skyline Track for example) rest with an appropriate pattern of development for the land. Kilmarston remain willing to assist Council realise those opportunities.  [see original submission]	Seeks that provisions are included for infrastructure to be permitted within the Natural Open Space Zone (NOSZ) to provide for a reservoir.  [inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.36	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Oppose	Forest & Bird does not support amendments to broadly permit reservoir construction in Natural Open Space Zone. If this submitter seeks to build such a utility, then it should be subject to a private plan change or similar open process. Amending districtwide provisions is not appropriate when the submitter is seeking to construct a reservoir in a specific location.	Disallow	Accept	No
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.14	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Amend	The NOSZ chapter should be amended to allow for more permissive rules related to campgrounds. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for vehicle-based camping in the Wellington District. Campgrounds can easily meet the objectives, policies and intention of this zone.	Seeks that the OSZ (Open Space Zone) chapter be amended to allow for more permissive rules related to campgrounds.	Reject	No
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.28	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Amend	Considers that the amount of public and green space to be provided needs to be made explicit.	Clarify the 'Open Space' chapter to explicitly state the amount of public and green spaces provided.	Reject	No
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.29	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Amend	Considers that access to green public space in the inner city and suburbs must include provision for children. Development of the Canal Reserve should also consider this.	Seeks that provisions be made for children's access to green public spaces.	Reject	No
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.30	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Amend	Considers that three areas within Mt Victoria require special amenity protection in the District Plan: - Mt Victoria bush and lookout - Town Belt - Canal Reserve - St Gerards	Seeks that special amenity protection be provided to: - Mt Victoria bush and lookout - Town Belt - Canal Reserve - St Gerards	Reject	No
Roseneath Residents' Association	FS49.10	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Support	Supports the approach of the MVRA submission, which seeks to protect and enhance the townscape of Mount Victoria. While MVRA particularly stresses the importance of protecting the much admired townscape of suburban housing on the lower to mid slopes of the hill, the submitter also agrees with the MVRA submission's reference to 'soft fringes' against the Town Belt, the importance of green and open spaces, and the iconic values of the wider views of Mount Victoria. The submitter particularly supports the reference to special protection being needed for 'Mt Victoria bush and lookout - Town Belt' and 'There have already been a number of encroachments on the Matairangi - Mt Victoria town belt to support private development.'  Supporting MVRA's reference to special protection for Mount Victoria bus and lookout – Town Belt' and avoiding further intrusions into what is read visually as Town Belt and the critical Mount Victoria Ridgeline, the submitter requests that protection for Mount Victoria Lookout is achieved by number 22 Alexandra Road retaining the Open Space zoning and Ridgeline and Hilltops protection status as it is in the Operative District Plan.  [Inferred reference to submission point 342.30]	Allow	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Matthew Wells, Adelina Reis and Sarah Rennie	F550.9	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Support	Supports the approach of the MVRA submission, which seeks to protect and enhance the townscape of Mount Victoria. While MVRA particularly stresses the importance of protecting the much admired townscape of suburban housing on the lower to mid slopes of the hill, we also agree with their submission's reference to 'soft fringes' against the Town Belt, the importance of green and open spaces, and the iconic values of the wider views of Mount Victoria. The submitter particularly supports the reference to special protection being needed for 'Mt Victoria bush and lookout - Town Belt' and 'There have already been a number of encroachments on the Matairangi - Mt Victoria town belt to support private development.'  Supporting MVRA's reference to special protection for Mount Victoria bus and lookout – Town Belt' and avoiding further intrusions into what is read visually as Town Belt and the critical Mount Victoria Ridgeline, the submitter requests that protection for Mount Victoria Lookout is achieved by number 22 Alexandra Road retaining the Open Space zoning and Ridgeline and Hilltops protection status as it is in the Operative District Plan.  [Inferred reference to submission point 342.30]	Allow		
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.16	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Support	Considers that the open space network takes on increased importance as a means of providing permeable surfaces to relieve some of the pressure on the storm water system. Open spaces also provide areas for citizens to utilize and enjoy and also supports the growing indigenous bird life in the city.	Retain the Open Space Zone network as notified.  [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.17	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Amend	Considers that there is opportunity to increase the range of open spaces for the public to enjoy. The town belt is not accessible for all and some underutilised spaces could provide additional open spaces.  The submitter provides an example being the green islands between Kent and Cambridge Terraces as an attractive walkway between Courtenay Place and the Basin Reserve. However, notes that it is not easy to walk from island to island. The public space at the eastern end of Courtenay Place (where the tripod sculpture is located) is an underutilised space which could be more inviting. With increased development, density and smaller housing a quality supply of public open spaces becomes more critical. Developers cannot be relied on to create enjoyable open public spaces.	Seeks that the extent of Open Space Zones be increased.	Accept in part	No
Waka Kotahi	370.407	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Amend	Considers some of the activities permitted in this chapter have the potential to generate significant traffic and have a significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network if not managed appropriately. As trip generation is proposed to be managed in the traffic chapter, specific reference should be included to that chapter. Permitted rules in this chapter should be also required to comply with the trip generation rules in the transport chapter.	Seeks to add a note to the Open Space Zone chapter:  <u>All activities in this chapter must comply with the trip generation thresholds in the transport chapter.</u>	Reject	No
Ross Judge	438.1	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Amend	Supports the rezoning of 39 Chapman Street from Open Space Zone to High Density Residential Zone. The 282 m2 area is in the process of being purchased from the WCC and has already been surveyed prior to the sale. The site is intended for housing development in conjunction with the subdivision at the back of 15 Chesterton Street. The site would be within the same walking distance to the Johnsonville railway station and other public transport as other Chesterton Street and Chapman St properties that will be classified as HRZ. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Rezone 39 Chapman Street from Open Space Zone to High Density Residential Zone.	Accept	Yes
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.71	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / New OSZ	Amend	Considers appropriate that amendments to the planning provisions to include provisions for infrastructure to be permitted within the Natural Open Space Zone (NOSZ). Considers that permitted infrastructure will assist in servicing future development.  Seeks that this can be by proposed designation or appropriate zoning to provide for a reservoir.  The Submitters land has been identified for residential development for at least 25 years. Considers that planning restrictions (overlays) over parts of the land do not assist in providing a framework for appropriate subdivision and land use for the subject property.  Considers that it is not an effective use of the land resource to provide for a few rural residential properties on and area of land (over 15ha) that has been zoned for residential development. [see original submission]	Seeks that provisions are included for infrastructure to be permitted within the Natural Open Space Zone (NOSZ) to provide for a reservoir.  [inferred decision requested]	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.37	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4, NOSZP5 Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / New OSZ	Oppose	Forest & Bird does not support amendments to broadly permit reservoir construction in Natural Open Space Zone. If this submitter seeks to build such a utility, then it should be subject to a private plan change or similar open process. Amending districtwide provisions is not appropriate when the submitter is seeking to construct a reservoir in a specific location.	Disallow	Accept	No
Andy Foster	FS86.61	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / New OSZ	Support	Considers that it is reasonable to allow a reservoir to be constructed on the rural – Open Space part of the land to service new development and existing surrounding suburbs. Care should be taken about how it is designed to fit in with the landform, landscape and vegetation.  [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to 290.71]	Allow	Reject	No
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.132	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / New OSZ	Amend	Considers that building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor. Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin the open space zone which does not currently include provision for boundary setbacks for buildings and structures.  KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures, and that the rail corridor be recognised as a qualifying matter in relevant non-residential zones in accordance with section 77(1)(o) of the RMA.  Consistent with the amendment requested for the assessment criteria in the residential zones, KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor.	Add new standard as follows:  <u>OSZ-SX:</u> <u>Boundary setbacks.</u> <u>Buildings or structures must not be located within a 5m setback from a rail corridor boundary.</u>  AND seeks that as applicable, the following matter of discretion be inserted:  <u>Matters of discretion:</u> <u>(X) The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u>	Accept in part	Yes
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.491	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-O1	Amend	Considers it appropriate to include wording to seek that natural open space areas are managed in a way so as to improve water quality and enhance habitat recognising that many of these areas include 'green' and 'blue' corridors of importance to Wellington City	Amend OSZ-O1 (Purpose) as follows: Open space areas are <u>predominantly</u> used by the public for a wide range of passive and active recreation activities, and may accommodate open space community activities, in such a way that maintains, and where possible, enhances the predominant character and amenity values <u>including water quality and biodiversity</u> , of the Open Space Zone, ....	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.408	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-O2	Support	Supports the inclusion of this objective which requires effects on the surrounding area to be managed effectively.	Retain OSZ-O2 (Managing effects) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.492	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-O2	Amend	Considers it appropriate to include wording to seek that adverse effects are not 'managed effectively' but rather, avoided, remedied or mitigated: this provides a clearer signal as to the importance of environmental protection of these areas as part of providing for their character and amenity.	Amend OSZ-O2 (Managing effects) as follows: Adverse effects of activities and development undertaken in the Open Space Zone at the Zone interface and the surrounding area are <u>avoided, remedied or mitigated</u> .	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.493	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-O3	Support	Considers there is insufficient focus on mana whenua and their ability to exercise kaitiakitanga: this objective helps to re-balance this.	Retain OSZ-O3 (Mana whenua) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.108	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-O3	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks to amend OSZ-O3 (Mana whenua) to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City". [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.56	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-O3	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.84	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-O3	Support in part	Supports that the provision acknowledges Ngāti Toa Rangatira as mana whenua in Te Whanganui a Tara and the relation this has to parks in Wellington.	Retain OSZ-O3 (Mana whenua) as notified.  [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No
Waka Kotahi	370.409	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P1	Amend	Considers some of the activities permitted in this chapter have the potential to generate significant traffic and have a significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network – particularly those that are of a larger scale or directly access the state highway network. Waka Kotahi requests that the wording of the policy is amended to include consideration of wider effects on the transport network	Amend OSZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows:  Enable a wide range of recreational activities, and a limited range of other activities that are compatible with the predominant purpose, character and amenity of the Open Space Zone, while ensuring that their scale and intensity is appropriate <u>and adverse effects on the wider environment, including the transport network, are managed.</u>	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.494	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P1	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity: enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain OSZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.495	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P2	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity: enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain OSZ-P2 (Small scale mobile commercial activities) as notified.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.410	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P3	Amend	Considers some of the activities permitted in this chapter have the potential to generate significant traffic and have a significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network – particularly those that are of a larger scale or directly access the state highway network. Waka Kotahi requests that the wording of the policy is amended to include consideration of wider effects on the transport network	Amend OSZ-P3 (Potentially compatible activities) as follows: ... 1. The activity maximises the use of existing buildings; <del>and</del> 2. Any reverse sensitivity effects can be appropriately managed; <u>and</u> 3. <u>Effects on the wider environment, including the transport network, are managed.</u>	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.496	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P3	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity: enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain OSZ-P3 (Potentially compatible activities) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.497	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P4	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity: enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain OSZ-P4 (Enabled buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept	No
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.42	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P4	Oppose	Panorama submits that that if 1 Upland Road is to remain OSZ, OSZ-P4 should not be retained as notified, but should be amended to include complementary activities in existing buildings, including Community Facilities.  The OSZ is intended for spaces and sites on which buildings and activities are small in scale and ancillary to recreation and other open space activities. The Botanic Gardens Management Plan makes no provision for the site, its building and present uses.  Council has intended that the site and its buildings be used for commercial purposes for over 120 years and intends that to continue for at least another 20 years. The objectives, policies and rules of the MUZ are better suited to the site and the territorial authority's functions and obligations under the Act.  The location, size, scale and nature of the buildings on this site are not intended for or utilised in a way that is ancillary to open space and conservation activities as presently drafted. They will not enhance the open space values of the adjacent Botanical Gardens or the wider city. However, if they are to remain within the OSZ (which is opposed), the OSZ provisions should be amended to accommodate and provide for the existing activities as permitted activities.  The purpose and principles of the Act are better achieved by the site being zoned MUZ or some equivalent zone intended to provide a similar outcome for clusters of commercial activity on fringes of residential zones with public transport connectivity. Alternatively, the OSZ should be amended to enable and provide for the present and similar activities to take place on the site as permitted or controlled activities.	Disallow / Seeks that OSZ-P4 should not be retained as notified if 1 Upland Road is to remain OSZ, but should be amended to include complementary activities in existing buildings, including Community Facilities.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.498	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P5	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity: enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain OSZ-P5 (Potentially compatible buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept	No



Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.43	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P5	Oppose	<p>Panorama submits that that if 1 Upland Road is to remain OSZ, OSZ-P5 should not be retained as notified, but should be amended to include complementary activities in existing buildings, including Community Facilities.</p> <p>The OSZ is intended for spaces and sites on which buildings and activities are small in scale and ancillary to recreation and other open space activities. The Botanic Gardens Management Plan makes no provision for the site, its building and present uses.</p> <p>Council has intended that the site and its buildings be used for commercial purposes for over 120 years and intends that to continue for at least another 20 years. The objectives, policies and rules of the MUZ are better suited to the site and the territorial authority's functions and obligations under the Act.</p> <p>The location, size, scale and nature of the buildings on this site are not intended for or utilised in a way that is ancillary to open space and conservation activities as presently drafted. They will not enhance the open space values of the adjacent Botanical Gardens or the wider city. However, if they are to remain within the OSZ (which is opposed), the OSZ provisions should be amended to accommodate and provide for the existing activities as permitted activities.</p> <p>The purpose and principles of the Act are better achieved by the site being zoned MUZ or some equivalent zone intended to provide a similar outcome for clusters of commercial activity on fringes of residential zones with public transport connectivity. Alternatively, the OSZ should be amended to enable and provide for the present and similar activities to take place on the site as permitted or controlled activities.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that OSZ-P5 should not be retained as notified if 1 Upland Road is to remain OSZ, but should be amended to include complementary activities in existing buildings, including Community Facilities.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.499	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P6	Support	Considers there is insufficient focus on mana whenua and their ability to exercise customary practices. This policy redresses this imbalance.	Retain OSZ-P6 (Mana whenua) as notified.	Accept	No
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.109	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P6	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks to amend OSZ-O3 (Mana whenua) to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City". [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.57	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P6	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow	Accept	No
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.85	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-P6	Support in part	Provides for customary activities and partnership with mana whenua in management of Wellington parks.	Retain OSZ-P6 (Mana whenua) as notified.  [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.411	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R1	Oppose	<p>Considers that these activities have the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, particularly those of a larger scale, or directly accessing the state highway network.</p> <p>Traffic generated from events is not considered to be adequately managed through this chapter or through the transport chapter.</p> <p>Activities in this chapter which exceed 100 equivalent car movements per day where they are accessed from state highway should require a traffic management plan. Permitted rules in this chapter should be also required to comply with the trip generation rules in the transport chapter.</p> <p>The permitted activity status of these activities is opposed with the trip generation thresholds proposed in the plan as notified.</p>	Seeks that if activities are to retain permitted activity status: - See submission point on trip generation which Waka Kotahi request are adopted. - Reference to the trip generation thresholds should be included in this chapter – and in the rule table of the activities referenced in this submission point.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.500	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R1	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here is appropriate for the open space zone.	Retain OSZ-R1 (Informal recreation activities) as notified.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Waka Kotahi	370.412	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R2	Oppose	<p>Considers that these activities have the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, particularly those of a larger scale, or directly accessing the state highway network.</p> <p>Traffic generated from events is not considered to be adequately managed through this chapter or through the transport chapter.</p> <p>Activities in this chapter which exceed 100 equivalent car movements per day where they are accessed from state highway should require a traffic management plan. Permitted rules in this chapter should be also required to comply with the trip generation rules in the transport chapter.</p> <p>The permitted activity status of these activities is opposed with the trip generation thresholds proposed in the plan as notified.</p>	<p>Seeks that if activities are to retain permitted activity status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See submission point on trip generation which Waka Kotahi request are adopted.</li> <li>- Reference to the trip generation thresholds should be included in this chapter – and in the rule table of the activities referenced in this submission point.</li> </ul>	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.501	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R4	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here is appropriate for the open space zone.	Retain OSZ-R2 (Organised sport and recreation activities) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.502	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R4	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here is appropriate for the open space zone.	Retain OSZ-R4 (Customary activities) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.503	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R6	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here is appropriate for the open space zone.	Retain OSZ-R5 (Gardens, including community gardens) as notified.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.413	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R6	Oppose	<p>Considers that these activities have the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, particularly those of a larger scale, or directly accessing the state highway network.</p> <p>Traffic generated from events is not considered to be adequately managed through this chapter or through the transport chapter.</p> <p>Activities in this chapter which exceed 100 equivalent car movements per day where they are accessed from state highway should require a traffic management plan. Permitted rules in this chapter should be also required to comply with the trip generation rules in the transport chapter.</p> <p>The permitted activity status of these activities is opposed with the trip generation thresholds proposed in the plan as notified.</p>	<p>Seeks that if activities are to retain permitted activity status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See submission point on trip generation which Waka Kotahi request are adopted.</li> <li>- Reference to the trip generation thresholds should be included in this chapter – and in the rule table of the activities referenced in this submission point.</li> </ul>	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.504	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R7	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here is appropriate for the open space zone.	Retain OSZ-R6 (Mobile commercial activities ancillary to permitted recreation and conservation	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.505	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R7	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here is appropriate for the open space zone.	Retain OSZ-R7 (Parks maintenance and repair) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.506	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R8	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here is appropriate for the open space zone.	Retain OSZ-R8 (Construction, maintenance, alteration of or addition to footpaths and tracks) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.507	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R9	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here is appropriate for the open space zone.	Retain OSZ-R9 (Construction, maintenance, alteration of, or addition to car parking areas and access drives) as notified.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.414	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R10	Oppose	<p>Considers that these activities have the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, particularly those of a larger scale, or directly accessing the state highway network.</p> <p>Traffic generated from events is not considered to be adequately managed through this chapter or through the transport chapter.</p> <p>Activities in this chapter which exceed 100 equivalent car movements per day where they are accessed from state highway should require a traffic management plan. Permitted rules in this chapter should be also required to comply with the trip generation rules in the transport chapter.</p> <p>The permitted activity status of these activities is opposed with the trip generation thresholds proposed in the plan as notified.</p>	<p>Seeks that if activities are to retain permitted activity status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See submission point on trip generation which Waka Kotahi request are adopted.</li> <li>- Reference to the trip generation thresholds should be included in this chapter – and in the rule table of the activities referenced in this submission point.</li> </ul>	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.508	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R10	Support	Supports providing for activities, of the type described here is appropriate for the open space zone.	Retain OSZ-R10 (Open space community activities in an existing building) as notified.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.44	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R10	Oppose	<p>Panorama submits that that if 1 Upland Road is to remain OSZ, OSZ-R10 should not be retained as notified, but should be amended to include complementary activities in existing buildings, including Community Facilities.</p> <p>The OSZ is intended for spaces and sites on which buildings and activities are small in scale and ancillary to recreation and other open space activities. The Botanic Gardens Management Plan makes no provision for the site, its building and present uses.</p> <p>Council has intended that the site and its buildings be used for commercial purposes for over 120 years and intends that to continue for at least another 20 years. The objectives, policies and rules of the MUZ are better suited to the site and the territorial authority's functions and obligations under the Act.</p> <p>The location, size, scale and nature of the buildings on this site are not intended for or utilised in a way that is ancillary to open space and conservation activities as presently drafted. They will not enhance the open space values of the adjacent Botanical Gardens or the wider city. However, if they are to remain within the OSZ (which is opposed), the OSZ provisions should be amended to accommodate and provide for the existing activities as permitted activities.</p> <p>The purpose and principles of the Act are better achieved by the site being zoned MUZ or some equivalent zone intended to provide a similar outcome for clusters of commercial activity on fringes of residential zones with public transport connectivity. Alternatively, the OSZ should be amended to enable and provide for the present and similar activities to take place on the site as permitted or controlled activities.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that OSZ-R10 should not be retained as notified if 1 Upland Road is to remain OSZ, but should be amended to include complementary activities in existing buildings, including Community Facilities.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.415	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R11	Support	Support discretionary activity status for activities not provided for as this will enable effects to be assessed and managed, including those to the transport network.	Retain OSZ-R11 (Any other activity not otherwise provided for in this table) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.509	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R11	Support	Supports providing for other activities with discretion is appropriate for the open space zone to help ensure these are appropriate to the character and amenity of the area, in accordance with its management plan, and avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects	Retain OSZ-R11 (Any other activity not otherwise provided for in this table) as notified.	Accept	No
Ministry of Education	400.150	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R11	Support	Supports OSZ-R11. Considering the specific purpose of OSZ, the submitter generally supports the activity status of Discretionary for educational facilities.	Retain OSZ-R11 (Any other activity not otherwise provided for in this table).	Accept	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.288	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R12	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain OSZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.289	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / OSZ-R12	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend OSZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	40.3	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES	Amend	Supports the definition of 'Conservation Activities', but seeks that this is expanded to include 'biosecurity' and 'agricultural aircraft activities'.	Amend the definition of Conservation Activities as follows: means the use of land for activities undertaken for the purposes of maintaining, protecting and/or enhancing the natural and/or ecological values of a natural resource. It may include activities which assist to enhance the public's appreciation and recreational enjoyment of the resource, including:  (a) species protection, <u>biosecurity</u> , and conservation management work, including restoration and revegetation; (b) pest and weed control <u>including the use of aircraft</u> ; and (c) educational activities.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	345.7	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES	Support in part	Considers the definition should be clear that activities to enhance appreciation and recreational enjoyment are only appropriate where they are consistent with the primary purpose. We therefore seek the following amendment:	Amend the definition of "conservation activities":  Means the use of land for activities undertaken for the purposes of maintaining, protecting and/or enhancing the natural and/or ecological values of a natural resource. It may include activities which assist to enhance the public's appreciation and recreational enjoyment of the resource, <u>where that is consistent with maintaining, protecting or enhancing the natural and/or ecological values.</u> <u>Activities may include including:</u> a. species protection and conservation management work, including restoration and revegetation; b. pest and weed control; and c. educational activities	Accept in part	Yes
Director-General of Conservation	385.13	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES	Support	Supports the proposed definition of Conservation Activities.	Retain the definition of 'Conservation Activities' as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.10	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	Considers that the Sewall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point is important infrastructure but is not captured within the definition of "Infrastructure" and therefore any maintenance, upgrading, repair, replacement or development of seawall does not engage infrastructure provisions of the PDP but rather the Natural Open Space Zone.  Submitter questions the efficiency and effectiveness of the Natural Open Space zoning and the associated planning framework insofar as it relates to this area.  [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the planning framework, insofar as it relates to the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point, should be updated to enable the ongoing maintenance, repair, upgrading and renewal of the existing seawall where it protects regionally significant infrastructure.	Accept in part	Yes
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.187	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers the majority of the seawall is below MHWS. It is important to understand that this area is a natural open space with impacts of the coastal process on the wall. The sea wall above MHWS needs to recognise RMA s6 matters of natural importance and promotion of the integrated management and consistency with the regional plan.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed relating to the removal of the land between Lyall Bay and Moa Point from the Natural Open Space Zone to the Airport Zone.  Remove any 'bespoke planning framework' from the Natural Open Space land between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.  Retain the Lyall Bay Sea Wall in the Natural Open Space Zone.	Accept in part	No
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.10	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow	Accept in part	No
Kilmarnock Developments Limited and Kilmarnock Properties Limited	290.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers zoning of area of NOSZ being restrictive and would limit building reservoir within the area. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that as an alternative to the provisions of the Natural Open Space Zone, that an area be carved out where reservoirs would be located, subsequently zone Residential.  [inferred decision requested]	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Janine Hearn	FS31.1	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Submitters' house faces the hill where the proposed developments are to happen. Submitters' family use the forested area entering via Silverstream road dog park into Huntleigh Park on bush walks frequently. The submitter goes up to Crows Nest through this track frequently. The submitter is teaching their children the value of our native bush by showing them what beautiful taonga they have spotted in the bush - flora and fauna.</p> <p>In the area of native forest that is proposed to be developed are resident native bird populations including Kaka, Piwakawaka, Kakariki (yes we have spotted them in there), Kereru, Riroriro (grey warbler) and Tui. The resident native bird population living in that area of bush is growing and growing. Predator Control in surrounding Ngaio and Crofton Downs has taken off allowing the resurgence of pests from suburbia to abate, and now the native bird life in these hills is flourishing. The bird song from native birds especially Kaka in that tract of bush is so loud, particularly at dawn and dusk. There is a particular tree within the submitted zone that is home to many kaka. This area of forest is ecological high value as submitted by GWRC in this report:  <a href="https://www.gw.govt.nz/assets/Documents/2020/04/Key-Native-Ecosystem-Operational-Plan-for-Western-Wellington-Forests-2019-2024.pdf">https://www.gw.govt.nz/assets/Documents/2020/04/Key-Native-Ecosystem-Operational-Plan-for-Western-Wellington-Forests-2019-2024.pdf</a></p>	Disallow / Seeks that any forested area not be rezoned to allowed forest to be developed into housing. The NOSZ (Natural Open Space Zone) should be applied to this site as per the Proposed District Plan.	Accept	No
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.3	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. Barry Cottier has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. He has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 Barry Cottier proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.	Accept	No
Jo McKenzie	FS64.2	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Jo McKenzie opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. The original submitter has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding.</p> <p>Jo McKenzie considers that original submitter has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 the original submitter proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.</p>	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.13	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	We are concerned that the biodiversity values of the submitter's properties would mean significant destruction of habitat and indigenous flora and fauna if a reservoir was to be constructed. This is out of step with s6(c) of the RMA. Furthermore, there is no analysis of the size of the footprint, the location or an assessment of whether this infrastructure is even necessary to service the site and the wider Ngaio area.	Disallow	Accept	No
Andy Foster	FS86.43	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Considers that it is not reasonable to allow for housing development to intrude into the land zoned Open Space and Rural in the Operative Plan. The landscape impacts would be substantial, both of any housing and of the roading access. The impacts on vegetation would also be significant. Notes that the area of bush at the bottom of the site, immediately adjacent to and climbing up from Silverstream Road is of particularly high quality. The concept of putting housing or an access road through it would be entirely unreasonable. For all these reasons Andy Foster opposes any development in this area beyond a carefully designed reservoir.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].  [Inferred reference to submission 290.3]</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Tracey Henderson	FS102.1	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Living so close to the proposed development we enjoy watching the HUGE amount of bird life flying to the trees. A large amount of Kaka, Piwakawaka, Tui and Keruru can be seen flying here on a daily basis. We frequently take hikes with the kids through the bush track up to Crows Nest, learning as we go. This area of forest is ecological high value as submitted by GWRC in this report:  <a href="https://www.gw.govt.nz/assets/Documents/2020/04/Key-Native-Ecosystem-Operational-Plan-for-Western-Wellington-Forests-2019-2024.pdf">https://www.gw.govt.nz/assets/Documents/2020/04/Key-Native-Ecosystem-Operational-Plan-for-Western-Wellington-Forests-2019-2024.pdf</a></p>	Disallow / Seeks that any forested area not be rezoned to allowed forest to be developed into housing. The NOSZ (Natural Open Space Zone) should be applied to this site as per the Proposed District Plan.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Not specified	<p>Considers that it is important that proposed NOSZ is introduced to protect the recreational, natural, landscape and ecological values of the Open Space areas that the Submitter owns.</p> <p>The Submitter currently permits access onto his land for informal recreation by the public. The land holding provide informal connections from Ngaio to Crow's Nest and the Skyline Walkway— both of which are entirely located within the proposed NOSZ.</p> <p>Considers that the proposed SAL provisions will be consistent with the NOSZ provisions which can better deal to the formation of access and buildings and structures to facilitate informal recreation activities.</p> <p>Considers this zoning on the balance of the Submitters land acceptable, subject to agreement being reached by WCC with Submitter on the appropriate tenure of the land.</p>	<p>Seeks that the proposed Natural Open Space Zone is retained, if subsequent tenure of zoning is agreed upon between the submitter and the Council.</p> <p>[inferred decision requested]</p>	Accept in part	No
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.4	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. Barry Cottier has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. He has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 Barry Cottier proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.	Accept in part	No
Jo McKenzie	FS64.4	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Jo McKenzie opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. The original submitter has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding.</p> <p>Jo McKenzie considers that original submitter has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous landuse consents had lapsed. In 2019 the original submitter proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.</p>	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.	Accept in part	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.15	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	It's unclear what is meant by 'tenure' of the land. We appreciate that this submitter shows good will to the community by permitting access onto his land for informal recreation by the public. The NOSZ should be retained but we are not clear what is being implied by negotiating tenure with the council. This process should be transparent and possibly subject to a private plan change if necessary.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission supporting the Natural Open Space zoning be allowed.	Accept	No
Rod Halliday	25.14	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that MDRZ overlay does not follow property boundaries at Atherton Terrace as shown in the approved subdivision plans (resource consents WCC SR Nos. 405728, 514495).</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Rezone part of the overlay behind Atherton Terrace from 'Natural Open Space Zone' to 'Medium Density Residential Zone'.</p> <p>[As illustrated in the submission]</p>	Addressed in Hearing Stream 2 Right of Reply	
Rod Halliday	25.15	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that Lot 5 (DP524106) at 35 Bickerton Rise has recently transferred to WCC as reserve.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Rezone part of the overlay at 35 Bickerton Rise from 'Medium Density Residential Zone' to 'Natural Open Space Zone'</p> <p>[As illustrated in the submission]</p>	Addressed in Hearing Stream 2 Right of Reply	
Rod Halliday	25.16	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that a section of 15 Antigua Way has been incorrectly zoned as a Natural Open Space Zone and should instead be categorized as Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Rezone the site at 15 Antigua Way from 'Natural Open Space Zone' to 'Medium Density Residential Zone' in its entirety.</p> <p>[As illustrated in the submission]</p>	Addressed in Hearing Stream 6 FUZ/DEV s42A	
Rod Halliday	25.17	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that a section of 47 Grenada Drive within the Lincolnshire Farm Development Area could be rezoned as Medium Density Residential Zone. This section does not contain high quality native bush and is suitable for residential development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Rezone part of the site at 47 Grenada Drive from 'Natural Open Space Zone' to 'Medium Density Residential Zone'.</p> <p>[As illustrated in the submission]</p>	Addressed in Hearing Stream 6 FUZ/DEV s42A	

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Coronation Real Estate Ltd	62.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Coronation Real Estate Ltd has made significant investment in the development of the site. The site is currently subject to existing resource consents, a pending resource consent and an existing building consent relating to development on the residentially zoned (northern) part of the site.  The proposed NOSZ zoning of the site in its entirety would make any potential future changes, additions or alterations inconsistent with the underlying zoning.	Rezone 9 Comber Place from Natural Open Space Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone .	Accept in part	Yes
Boston Real Estate Limited	220.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the Natural Open Space Zone is inappropriate on a portion of the site because:  The current operative plan has split the site into two separate zones, a business area zone and a residential zone.  The Natural Open Space Zone is intended to recognise high natural, ecological and historic heritage values.  The surrounding properties are maintaining similar zones from the operative district plan to the proposed district plans.  it is held in private ownership. This means that the public will have no access along this area or be able to use it.  This site is extremely steep and no development has occurred yet due to the difficult site conditions.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Rezone the NOSZ (Natural Open Space Zone) at 62 Kaiwharawhara Road to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept	Yes
Wellington City Council	266.47	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers part of 9 Comber Place, Johnsonville should be re-zoned from Natural Open Space Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone to correct a mapping error. The part of 9 Comber Place to the east of the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay should be MRZ. This reflects the zoning of the Operative District Plan.	Seeks to re-zone part of 9 Comber Place, Johnsonville (east of the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay) from NOSZ (Natural Open Space Zone) to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) as shown in image supplied in full submission.	Accept in part	Yes
Panorama Property Limited	FS11.41	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	This point on mapping omits to address the anomaly that is the inclusion of 1 Upland Road in the OSZ. Panorama opposes these mapping errors/changes because they omit to redraw the OSZ to exclude the Site and are incomplete as a result.  Panorama submits that the inclusion of the site in the OSZ is contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA and the Council's obligations and functions under the RMA and is unsupported by the Council's s 32 assessment.  The site is owned by Council on behalf of the city's ratepayers and provides a reasonable rate of return under the long-term commercial lease. Its zoning should reflect that commercial reality.  Panorama refers back to their submission (#10.1) for reasons and relief sought.  [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Disallow / Seeks that the submission point is disallowed, or alternative relief that may give better effect to the issues described in the further submission.	Reject	No
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Submitter requests their land be returned to zoning which existed within the Operative District Plan (Open Space Zone - Conservation). [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add Open Space Zone - Conservation to the Proposed District Plan. [Inferred decision requested]	Addressed in Hearing Stream 2 s42A report	
Paul Blaschke	FS129.3	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Supports submission points relating to land that has been rezoned Medium Density Residential Zone from Natural Open Space Zone, be rezoned back to Natural Open Space Zone in the mapping. This position reflects the historical understanding reached between the Trust and the Manawa Karioi Society, which retains and protects the Open Space reserve nature of the bush areas, at the same time as identifying land within the 44 Rhine Street lot that could be developed to support the aspirations of the Trust and of the wider Maori and city populations.	Allow	Addressed in Hearing Stream 2 s42A report	
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.17	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that 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 is amended from Natural Open Space Zone to Medium Density Residential with a 'Te Motu Kairangi Precinct' with associated objectives, policies, rules and standards to recognise the cultural and environmental overlays over the site whilst enabling Taranaki Whānui to exercise their customary responsibilities as kaitiaki, and to undertake development that supports their cultural, social and economic wellbeing.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.17	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	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, with 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.	Accept	No
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.27	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Taranaki Whānui's proposal would seem to allow another large and obtrusive development on the prison site, à la Shelly Bay, by sale of the land, if acquired under the right of first refusal, to a commercial developer.  Support Papakāinga development that keeps to the 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops, as long as native trees and vegetation are protected. Such a housing development should also be compatible with the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park. The local community, the wider Wellington community and all iwi groups should be involved in any decisions made.	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission that could open up the Mount Crawford site to large-scale commercial housing development be disallowed.	Accept	No
Geoff Todd	FS21.3	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Opposes any amendment to the natural open space zone on Watts Peninsula and in the vicinity of the prison:  a) This request goes against what I understood was agreed by government and Iwi as part of the Waitangi settlement process in which Iwi acquired Shelley Bay for redevelopment and the parties agreed that "Watts Peninsula should be protected, preserved and developed as a distinctive national destination that brings together the natural environment, national heritage, recreation, culture and the arts"  b) As described above the area has important historical features to be preserved, recreational benefits, visual and natural features and is important as a site for regenerating the biological diversity once present on the peninsula. Any further habitation will negatively impact the area.	Disallow	Accept	No
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.5	General/ Mapping/ Rezone/ Rezone	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 Whānui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.  [Inferred reference to submission 389.17].	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.249	General/ Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that the land already penetrates WIAL's obstacle limitation surface (WIAL1 designation). Further investigations should be undertaken to confirm that the area is either afforded sufficient terrain shielding, or a 8m height restriction should be imposed on all buildings, objects and structures to ensure activities do not pose a potential risk to aircraft.	Disallow / Seeks that part of submission be disallowed.	Accept	No



Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.17	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>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.</p> <p>Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Disallow all proposals by Taranaki Whānui 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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Disallow		
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.27	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>The submission by Taranaki Whānui is not specific on this matter but seems to imply that the site be open for medium density housing development. We would support proposals for papakainga on the site provided 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops are observed. Buildings should not be visible from the harbour and native trees and vegetation should be protected and regenerated. Access should be restricted to existing roads; no road access should be allowed from Shelly Bay or adjacent hillsides.</p> <p>Disallow any provisions which would allow the Mount Crawford site to be sold to a commercial property developer (as happened at Shelly Bay) and current provisions regarding height limits, ridgelines and hilltops to be removed. Any housing development should be compatible with and sympathetic to the values of the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park proposed for Watts Peninsula, and the local community should be involved in all decision making.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.17	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>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."</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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."</p>	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Lance Lones	FS81.3	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>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 piwakawaka and tūī, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	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.	Accept	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.116	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers the submission point is more enabling of intensification than the NPS-UD and MDRS and is not justified.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.43	Part 3 / Designations / General point on Designations / General point on Designations	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust supports the extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford, and the proposed zoning of the prison land. This is an important part of Wellington's current green space, which Wellington Civic Trust has had a long interest and involvement in, and the overlays and zoning are appropriate.	Disallow	Accept	No
Andy Foster	FS86.11	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whānui 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 Whānui 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.17]</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.97	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that there is significant heritage buildings (Mount Crawford Prison and WWI gun emplacements are located on Watts peninsular and require heritage recognition and protection, currently provided by the open space and town belt designations.	Disallow	Accept	No
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.18	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that 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 is amended from Natural Open Space Zone to Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone that would include objectives, policies, rules and standards to recognise the cultural and environmental overlays over the site whilst enabling Taranaki Whānui to exercise their customary responsibilities as kaitiaki, and to undertake development that supports their cultural, social and economic wellbeing.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Geoff Todd	FS21.4	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Opposes any amendment to the natural open space zone on Watts Peninsula and in the vicinity of the prison:</p> <p>a) This request goes against what I understood was agreed by government and Iwi as part of the Waitangi settlement process in which Iwi acquired Shelley Bay for redevelopment and the parties agreed that "Watts Peninsula should be protected, preserved and developed as a distinctive national destination that brings together the natural environment, national heritage, recreation, culture and the arts"</p> <p>b) As described above the area has important historical features to be preserved, recreational benefits, visual and natural features and is important as a site for regenerating the biological diversity once present on the peninsula. Any further habitation will negatively impact the area.</p>	Disallow		
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.6	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 Whānui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.18].</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.250	General/ Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that the land already penetrates WIAL's obstacle limitation surface (WIAL1 designation). Further investigations should be undertaken to confirm that the area is either afforded sufficient terrain shielding, or a 8m height restriction should be imposed on all buildings, objects and structures to ensure activities do not pose a potential risk to aircraft.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that part of submission be disallowed.	Accept	No
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.18	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>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."</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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."</p>	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Lance Lones	FS81.4	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>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 piwakawaka and tūī, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	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.	Accept	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.117	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers the submission point is more enabling of intensification than the NPS-UD and MDRS and is not justified.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.44	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Rezone	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust supports the extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford, and the proposed zoning of the prison land. This is an important part of Wellington's current green space, which Wellington Civic Trust has had a long interest and involvement in, and the overlays and zoning are appropriate.	Disallow	Accept	No
Andy Foster	FS86.12	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whānui 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.18]</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.98	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that there is significant heritage buildings (Mount Crawford Prison and WWI gun emplacements are located on Watts peninsular and require heritage recognition and protection, currently provided by the open space and town belt designations.	Disallow	Accept	No
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.19	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that 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 is amended from Natural Open Space Zone to any other suitable zone that will enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise their customary responsibilities as kaitiaki, and to undertake development that supports their cultural, social, and economic wellbeing.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.28	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui's proposal would seem to allow another large and obtrusive development on the prison site, à la Shelly Bay, by sale of the land, if acquired under the right of first refusal, to a commercial developer.</p> <p>Support Papakāinga development that keeps to the 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops, as long as native trees and vegetation are protected. Such a housing development should also be compatible with the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park. The local community, the wider Wellington community and all iwi groups should be involved in any decisions made.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission that could open up the Mount Crawford site to large-scale commercial housing development be disallowed.	Accept	No
Geoff Todd	FS21.5	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Opposes any amendment to the natural open space zone on Watts Peninsula and in the vicinity of the prison:</p> <p>a) This request goes against what I understood was agreed by government and Iwi as part of the Waitangi settlement process in which Iwi acquired Shelley Bay for redevelopment and the parties agreed that "Watts Peninsula should be protected, preserved and developed as a distinctive national destination that brings together the natural environment, national heritage, recreation, culture and the arts"</p> <p>b) As described above the area has important historical features to be preserved, recreational benefits, visual and natural features and is important as a site for regenerating the biological diversity once present on the peninsula. Any further habitation will negatively impact the area.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.7	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 Whānui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.19].</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.251	General/ Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that the land already penetrates WIAL's obstacle limitation surface (WIAL1 designation). Further investigations should be undertaken to confirm that the area is either afforded sufficient terrain shielding, or a 8m height restriction should be imposed on all buildings, objects and structures to ensure activities do not pose a potential risk to aircraft.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that part of submission be disallowed.	Accept	No
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.28	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>The submission by Taranaki Whānui is not specific on this matter but seems to imply that the site be open for medium density housing development. We would support proposals for papakainga on the site provided 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops are observed. Buildings should not be visible from the harbour and native trees and vegetation should be protected and regenerated. Access should be restricted to existing roads; no road access should be allowed from Shelly Bay or adjacent hillsides.</p> <p>Disallow any provisions which would allow the Mount Crawford site to be sold to a commercial property developer (as happened at Shelly Bay) and current provisions regarding height limits, ridgelines and hilltops to be removed. Any housing development should be compatible with and sympathetic to the values of the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park proposed for Watts Peninsula, and the local community should be involved in all decision making.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.19	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>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."</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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."</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Lance Lones	FS81.5	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>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 piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	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.	Accept	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.118	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers the submission point is more enabling of intensification than the NPS-UD and MDRS and is not justified.	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.45	General / Mapping /	Oppose	Wellington Civic Trust supports the extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Andy Foster	FS86.13	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whānui 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 Whānui 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.19]</p>	Disallow		
Historic Places	FS111.99	General / Mapping /	Oppose	Considers that there is significant heritage buildings (Mount Crawford Prison and WWI gun	Disallow	Accept	No
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.20	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that in addition to any amendment from rezoning 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 is amended from Natural Open Space Zone, that any other such amendments that are most appropriate to address this submission.	Reject	No
Geoff Todd	FS21.6	General / Mapping /	Oppose	Opposes any amendment to the natural open space zone on Watts Peninsula and in the vicinity of	Disallow	Accept	No
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.8	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 Whānui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.20].</p>	Disallow		
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.252	General/ Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that the land already penetrates WIAL's obstacle limitation surface (WIAL1 designation). Further investigations should be undertaken to confirm that the area is either afforded sufficient terrain shielding, or a 8m height restriction should be imposed on all buildings, objects and structures to ensure activities do not pose a potential risk to aircraft.	Disallow / Seeks that part of submission be disallowed.	Accept	No
						Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.20	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>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."</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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."</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Lance Lones	FS81.6	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>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 piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	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.	Accept	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.119	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Considers the submission point is more enabling of intensification than the NPS-UD and MDRS and is not justified.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.100	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Considers that there is significant heritage buildings (Mount Crawford Prison and WWI gun emplacements are located on Watts peninsula and require heritage recognition and protection, currently provided by the open space and town belt designations.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.22	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>The area of Natural Open Space zoned land located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be rezoned to an alternative land use zone which more accurately reflects the existing environment, including the significant hard engineering structures which currently protect Moa Point Road, the wastewater treatment network and Wellington International Airport from the effects of coastal erosion; or,</p> <p>A bespoke planning framework be inserted into the Natural Open Space Zone chapter that recognises the role and function of seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and provide for its ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Remove the area of the seawall and associated structures above mean high water springs between Lyall Bay and Moa Point from the Natural Open Space zone and rezone to an alternative more appropriate zone (such as Airport Zone) or sub zone. (Option A).	Reject	No



Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.185	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers the majority of the seawall is below MHWS. It is important to understand that this area is a natural open space with impacts of the coastal process on the wall. The sea wall above MHWS needs to recognise RMA s6 matters of natural importance and promotion of the integrated management and consistency with the regional plan.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed relating to the removal of the land between Lyall Bay and Moa Point from the Natural Open Space Zone to the Airport Zone.  Remove any 'bespoke planning framework' from the Natural Open Space land between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.  Retain the Lyall Bay Sea Wall in the Natural Open Space Zone.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.23	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes NOSZ (Natural Open Space Zone) zoning in the area on the Sea Wall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and seeks that it is rezoned.  The area of Natural Open Space zoned land located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be rezoned to an alternative land use zone which more accurately reflects the existing environment, including the significant hard engineering structures which currently protect Moa Point Road, the wastewater treatment network and Wellington International Airport from the effects of coastal erosion; or,  A bespoke planning framework be inserted into the Natural Open Space Zone chapter that recognises the role and function of seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and provide for its ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Rezone the area on the Sea Wall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point from Natural Open Space Zone to Airport Zone.	Reject	No
Guardians of the Bays Inc	FS44.186	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers the majority of the seawall is below MHWS. It is important to understand that this area is a natural open space with impacts of the coastal process on the wall. The sea wall above MHWS needs to recognise RMA s6 matters of natural importance and promotion of the integrated management and consistency with the regional plan.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission points be disallowed relating to the removal of the land between Lyall Bay and Moa Point from the Natural Open Space Zone to the Airport Zone.  Remove any 'bespoke planning framework' from the Natural Open Space land between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.  Retain the Lyall Bay Sea Wall in the Natural Open Space Zone.	Accept	No
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.9	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the Natural Open Space zoning on the balance land to the south-west, subject to an agreement being reached with the submitter on appropriate tenure.	Retain zoning of Natural Open Space zoned land, depending on the tenure of zoning.	Accept in part	No
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.14	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Oppose	Considers that while Kilmarston Development's support of the NOSZ is commendable for the SW area of their land, the zoning should not and cannot be conditional on appropriate tenure arrangements. The NOSZ zoning is entirely in keeping with the land's very high biodiversity values. It has some of the best examples of native forest in Wellington with mature podocarps such as matai, miro and totara interspersed in mature tawa and kohekohe forest. The natural values here are incredibly high and support a widening variety of resident native birds such as kakariki, kaka, kereru and occasionally bellbird (korimako). These values were recognised in the conditions of the environment court consents and the local community are well aware of the special nature of this land. While the community is very appreciative of being able to use the land over the years, it is inappropriate to suggest zoning of this sort is conditions on the land being purchased by WCC. Much of this land is already zoned Open Space B so the proposed District Plan is merely translating this existing status to its new equivalent.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that suggests tying the NOSZ zoning to the future tenure of the land. The proposed zoning should be retained as unconditional for the area as mapped and currently Open Space B.	Accept	No
Jo McKenzie	FS64.14	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Oppose	Considers that while Kilmarston Development's support of the NOSZ is commendable for the SW area of their land, the zoning should not and cannot be conditional on appropriate tenure arrangements. The NOSZ zoning is entirely in keeping with the land's very high biodiversity values. It has some of the best examples of native forest in Wellington with mature podocarps such as matai, miro and totara interspersed in mature tawa and kohekohe forest. The natural values here are incredibly high and support a widening variety of resident native birds such as kakariki, kaka, kereru and occasionally bellbird (korimako). These values were recognised in the conditions of the environment court consents and the local community are well aware of the special nature of this land. Considers that while the community is very appreciative of being able to use the land over the years, it is inappropriate to suggest zoning of this sort is conditions on the land being purchased by WCC. Much of this land is already zoned Open Space B so the proposed District Plan is merely translating this existing status to its new equivalent.	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that suggests tying the NOSZ zoning to the future tenure of the land. The proposed zoning should be retained as unconditional for the area mapped and currently Open Space B.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.19	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	We endorse retention of zoning of Natural Open Space zoned land. Tenure needs to consider biodiversity outcomes, not just enablement of subdivision.	Allow / Supports in part and seeks that the part of the submission supporting the Natural Open Space zoning on the balance land to the south-west be allowed.	Accept in part	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Marilyn Powell	281.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that picnickers enjoy sitting on the grass and looking out at the view there.  The area could have park benches added for visitors to rest on when walking the area and for the existing government workers who currently lunch there to use.	Seeks that Wellington City Council purchase the green space area at 107 Hill Street and convert it to a public recreation area.	Reject	No
Catharine Underwood	481.13	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Seeks that this would protect the valley location of Zealandia from aero plane noise and make listening to kiwi calling at night a much better experience.	Seeks a no commercial plane/helicopter fly zone between Mt Kaukau and Te Ahumairangi and over the Zealandia valley.	Reject	No
Wellington Helicopters	F55.1	General/ Other/ Other/Other	Oppose	Restriction of flying through this area would restrict Wellington Helicopters' ability to operate and possibly introduce compromises to safety by restricting the available operating area. The comment regarding hearing kiwis would only be relevant at night.	Disallow	Accept	No
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.111	Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that 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 is amended from Natural Open Space Zone to Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone that would include objectives, policies, rules and standards to recognise the cultural and environmental overlays over the site whilst enabling Taranaki Whānui to exercise their customary responsibilities as kaitiaki, and to undertake development that supports their cultural, social and economic wellbeing.	Reject	No
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.15	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zone / General point on Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones	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 Whānui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.  [Inferred reference to submission 389.111].	Disallow	Accept	No
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.35	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones	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	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Lance Lones	FS81.20	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zone / General point on Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones	Oppose	<p>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 piwakawaka and tūī, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	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.	Accept	No
Andy Foster	FS86.21	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones / General point on Special Purpose Zones	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whānui 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 Whānui 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.111]</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.12	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Considers that there is potential for these overlays to significantly restrict future development and opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga over our ancestral lands.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui support 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.</p>	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.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.4	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold the land it owned at Shelly Bay to The Wellington Company for a large development which was consented via the Special Housing Accords Act, thus denying the community any say on the consenting process. Community involvement should be ensured for the future though and the current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land should remain. A recent poll has shown that the wider Wellington public want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park centred on the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula already designated for a reserve by the Government.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have treated Shelly Bay solely as a commercial proposition despite disagreement by a large group of its members (Mau Whenua) who occupied the site and opposed its sale, wanting to uphold their cultural and spiritual connection to the land. Mau Whenua continue to oppose the sale of the land at Shelly Bay and should be included by the council in all decisions taken about its future.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.	Accept	No
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.14	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>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, with 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.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.	Accept	No
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.25	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui's proposal would seem to allow another large and obtrusive development on the prison site, à la Shelly Bay, by sale of the land, if acquired under the right of first refusal, to a commercial developer.</p> <p>Support Papakāinga development that keeps to the 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops, as long as native trees and vegetation are protected. Such a housing development should also be compatible with the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park. The local community, the wider Wellington community and all iwi groups should be involved in any decisions made.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission that could open up the Mount Crawford site to large-scale commercial housing development be disallowed.	Accept	No
Geoff Todd	FS21.1	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Opposes submission 389 requested changes to the zoning and overlays as:</p> <p>a) The area has significant historic value reflecting all the periods from the first maori settlers through to European settlement, threat of invasions and recent recreational use.</p> <p>b) The area has recreational and visual values to the people living on the peninsula, the people in Wellington, Iwi and the nation. This was reported on 3 News on 1/11/2011 and the vision expressed by politicians, local councillors and Iwi was of a public reserve with many important sites to be preserved. Sir Ngatata Love said "There are very few options in capital cities in countries like this where we can make such a major decision and look forward to preserving both the history and the future of our nation."</p> <p>c) Open space zoning has been in place for at least 30 years. I believe this has never been contested and is important to the people on the peninsula. Open zoning does not anticipate a built environment.</p> <p>d) The ridge and hilltop overlay, again not new, reflects the visual importance of the skyline across Wellington</p> <p>e) the significant natural area overlay reflects the opportunity to restore the natural habitat in a rodent free environment, restoring the presence of the birds that once lived here. Imagine the peace and tranquility possible in the midst of our city. This will build on the big investment in eliminating rodent and other pests on the peninsula</p>	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.3	General/ Mapping/ Mapping General/ Mapping General	Oppose	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.12].</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.247	General / Mapping / General	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that the land already penetrates WIAL's obstacle limitation surface (WIAL1 designation). Further investigations should be undertaken to confirm that the area is either afforded sufficient terrain shielding, or a 8m height restriction should be imposed on all buildings, objects and structures to ensure activities do not pose a potential risk to aircraft.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that part of submission be disallowed.	Accept	No
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whanui has sold its holdings at Shelly Bay and are no longer, as claimed, 'significant landowners'. Their possible ownership interest in the peninsula as a whole through Right of First Refusal is confined to the Mt Crawford site as the adjacent 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been designated reserve by the government (the current landowner) and WCC since 2011.</p> <p>The local community, despite its active interest in and use of the bay, was shut out of all consultation during the resource consent process. It is critical that it be involved in all future decision making.</p> <p>The current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land is supported not only by the local community but by the wider Wellington public, as evidenced in the independent poll conducted for the group Buy Back the Bay by Research NZ, which showed that 78% of Wellingtonians want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park, which would also include the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula set aside by the government as a reserve in 2011.</p> <p>Taranaki Whanui have viewed Shelly Bay as a strictly commercial proposition and disavowed any cultural, historical and spiritual connection to the site. A substantial proportion of the iwi (mau whenua) have opposed and continue to oppose the sale of the site, and should be included by the council in all democratic decision making about the future of Shelly Bay.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.14	Mapping / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>From 2011 the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been set aside by the government as a reserve, to</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.25	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>The submission by Taranaki Whanui is not specific on this matter but seems to imply that the site be open for medium density housing development. We would support proposals for papakainga on the site provided 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops are observed. Buildings should not be visible from the harbour and native trees and vegetation should be protected and regenerated. Access should be restricted to existing roads; no road access should be allowed from Shelly Bay or adjacent hillsides.</p> <p>Disallow any provisions which would allow the Mount Crawford site to be sold to a commercial property developer (as happened at Shelly Bay) and current provisions regarding height limits, ridgelines and hilltops to be removed. Any housing development should be compatible with and sympathetic to the values of the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park proposed for Watts Peninsula, and the local community should be involved in all decision making.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.2	General / Mapping / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>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."</p> <p>It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning maps</li> <li>• He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter</li> <li>• Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter</li> <li>• Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter</li> <li>• Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter</li> <li>• Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter</li> <li>• Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter</li> <li>• Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter</li> </ul> <p>Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Lance Lones	FS81.1	General/ Mapping/ Mapping General	Oppose	<p>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 piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	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.	Accept	No
Andy Foster	FS86.9	General / Mapping / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whānui 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 Whānui 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.12]</p>	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.13	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	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.	Reject	No
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.5	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold the land it owned at Shelly Bay to The Wellington Company for a large development which was consented via the Special Housing Accords Act, thus denying the community any say on the consenting process. Community involvement should be ensured for the future though and the current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land should remain. A recent poll has shown that the wider Wellington public want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park centred on the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula already designated for a reserve by the Government.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have treated Shelly Bay solely as a commercial proposition despite disagreement by a large group of its members (Mau Whenua) who occupied the site and opposed its sale, wanting to uphold their cultural and spiritual connection to the land. Mau Whenua continue to oppose the sale of the land at Shelly Bay and should be included by the council in all decisions taken about its future.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.	Accept	No
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.15	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>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, with 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.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.	Accept	No
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.26	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui's proposal would seem to allow another large and obtrusive development on the prison site, à la Shelly Bay, by sale of the land, if acquired under the right of first refusal, to a commercial developer.</p> <p>Support Papakāinga development that keeps to the 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops, as long as native trees and vegetation are protected. Such a housing development should also be compatible with the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park. The local community, the wider Wellington community and all iwi groups should be involved in any decisions made.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission that could open up the Mount Crawford site to large-scale commercial housing development be disallowed.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Geoff Todd	FS21.2	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>I oppose the submission 389 requested changes to the zoning and overlays as:</p> <p>a) The area has significant historic value reflecting all the periods from the first maori settlers through to European settlement, threat of invasions and recent recreational use.</p> <p>b) The area has recreational and visual values to the poeple living on the peninsula, the people in Wellington, Iwi and the nation. This was reported on 3 News on 1/11/2011 and the vision expressed by politicians, local councillors and Iwi was of a public reserve with many important sites to be preserved. Sir Ngatata Love said "There are very few options in capital cities in countries like this where we can make such a major decision and look forward to preserving both the history and the future of our nation."</p> <p>c) Open space zoning has been in place for at least 30 years. I believe this has never been contested and is important to the people on the peninsula. Open zoning does not anticipate a built environment.</p> <p>d) The ridge and hilltop overlay , again not new , reflects the visual importance of the skyline across wellington</p> <p>e) the significant natural area overlay reflects the opportunity to restore the natural habitat in a rodent free environment, restoring the presence of the birds that once lived here. Imagine the peace and tranquility possible in the midst of our city. This will build on the big investment in eliminating rodent and other pests on the peninsula</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.4	General/ Mapping/ Mapping General/ Mapping General	Oppose	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.13].</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.248	General / Mapping / General	Oppose	<p>WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that the land already penetrates WIAL's obstacle limitation surface (WIAL1 designation). Further investigations should be undertaken to confirm that the area is either afforded sufficient terrain shielding, or a 8m height restriction should be imposed on all buildings, objects and structures to ensure activities do not pose a potential risk to aircraft.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that part of submission be disallowed.	Accept	No



Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whanui has sold its holdings at Shelly Bay and are no longer, as claimed, 'significant landowners'. Their possible ownership interest in the peninsula as a whole through Right of First Refusal is confined to the Mt Crawford site as the adjacent 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been designated reserve by the government (the current landowner) and WCC since 2011.</p> <p>The local community, despite its active interest in and use of the bay, was shut out of all consultation during the resource consent process. It is critical that it be involved in all future decision making.</p> <p>The current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land is supported not only by the local community but by the wider Wellington public, as evidenced in the independent poll conducted for the group Buy Back the Bay by Research NZ, which showed that 78% of Wellingtonians want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park, which would also include the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula set aside by the government as a reserve in 2011.</p> <p>Taranaki Whanui have viewed Shelly Bay as a strictly commercial proposition and disavowed any cultural, historical and spiritual connection to the site. A substantial proportion of the iwi (mau whenua) have opposed and continue to oppose the sale of the site, and should be included by the council in all democratic decision making about the future of Shelly Bay.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.15	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>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.</p> <p>Submitter supports the proposal of Buy Back the Bay group that the area should become a National Heritage Park.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.26	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>The submission by Taranaki Whanui is not specific on this matter but seems to imply that the site be open for medium density housing development. We would support proposals for papakainga on the site provided 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops are observed. Buildings should not be visible from the harbour and native trees and vegetation should be protected and regenerated. Access should be restricted to existing roads; no road access should be allowed from Shelly Bay or adjacent hillsides.</p> <p>Disallow any provisions which would allow the Mount Crawford site to be sold to a commercial property developer (as happened at Shelly Bay) and current provisions regarding height limits, ridgelines and hilltops to be removed. Any housing development should be compatible with and sympathetic to the values of the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park proposed for Watts Peninsula, and the local community should be involved in all decision making.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.3	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>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."</p> <p>It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning maps</li> <li>• He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter</li> <li>• Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter</li> <li>• Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Koiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter</li> <li>• Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter</li> <li>• Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter</li> <li>• Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter</li> <li>• Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter</li> </ul> <p>Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.</p>	Disallow		
Lance Lones	FS81.2	General/ Mapping/ Mapping General/ Mapping General	Oppose	<p>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 piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	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.	Accept	No
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.42	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Port Zone / PORTZ-PREC01-P4	Oppose	<p>Wellington Civic Trust supports the extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford, and the proposed zoning of the prison land. This is an important part of Wellington's current green space, which Wellington Civic Trust has had a long interest and involvement in, and the overlays and zoning are appropriate.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Andy Foster	FS86.10	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>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 Whanui's submission.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Taranaki Whanui'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.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.13]</p>	Disallow		
Sarah Crawford	FS118.1	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	<p>Considers that the Miramar Peninsula and Shelly Bay need to be protected. The Miramar Peninsula is iconic and a magnificent landmark - an oasis in our capital city of Wellington. We see it when we fly into Wellington or travel in our buses, vehicles, trains and ferries. The Miramar Peninsula is an integral part of our visual landscape, where ever we live or work, for example Newtown, Wellington's CBD, the western hills of Wellington and Lower Hutt, Petone, Eastbourne, driving down the Wainui Hill and on our daily commute on the motorway.</p> <p>Considers that it is so visual that we do not realise that this land mark was such a treasure until urbanization destroyed it with increased building height lines which affects the contours of the hills, the vegetation, the predator free environment, the prison gardens and the fantastic untamed environment, which we all love.</p> <p>Sarah Crawford recognises that both the cultural and historical significance and as well the contribution of this land to the recreational enjoyment of the population of the Wellington region. It must be protected for our children, their children and future generations.</p> <p>Considers that the Miramar Peninsula has not always been valued in the past by central or local government .</p> <p>[Refer to Further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	40.9	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Amend	The NOSZ chapter has no provisions for the intermittent use of aircraft for agricultural aviation activities.	Seeks that the intermittent use of aircraft for agricultural aviation activities is included in the Proposed District Plan as permitted activity in the Natural Open Space Zone.	Accept	No
Coronation Real Estate Ltd	62.5	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Oppose	Opposes the zoning of the entire site at 9 Comber Place as NOSZ.	Seeks that the entirety of the site at 9 Comber Place is zoned Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject	No
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.61	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Support	Considers that maintaining natural open spaces is an excellent initiative to improve community, wellbeing, and connection with nature. This not only can have mental health benefits but can also mobilise climate or environmental action.	Seeks the retention of natural open spaces.	Accept in part	Yes
						Accept in part	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Boston Real Estate Limited	220.3	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that the Natural Open Space Zone is inappropriate on a portion of the site because:</p> <p>The current operative plan has split the site into two separate zones, a business area zone and a residential zone.</p> <p>The Natural Open Space Zone is intended to recognise high natural, ecological and historic heritage values.</p> <p>The surrounding properties are maintaining similar zones from the operative district plan to the proposed district plans.</p> <p>it is held in private ownership. This means that the public will have no access along this area or be able to use it.</p> <p>This site is extremely steep and no development has occurred yet due to the difficult site conditions.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the Natural Open Space Zone at 62 Kaiwharawhara Road is rezoned to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept	Yes
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.13	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Amend	The NOSZ chapter should be amended to allow for more permissive rules related to campgrounds. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for vehicle-based camping in the Wellington District. Campgrounds can easily meet the objectives, policies and intention of this zone.	Seeks that the NOSZ (Natural Open Space Zone) chapter be amended to allow for more permissive rules related to campgrounds.	Reject	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.393	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Support in part	<p>Notes land in this zone contains high ecological and other values. While some areas within this zone will have vegetation removal rules applying because of the SNA overlay, there do not appear to be any other restrictions on vegetation clearance in this zone.</p> <p>We have sought a general vegetation clearance rule in the ECO chapter, outside of SNAs. It seems particularly important in this zone to have such a rule. Amend rules to include a general vegetation clearance rule</p> <p>We also seek a policy in this chapter to protect biodiversity and vegetation values outside SNAs.</p>	Add new rule NOSZ-RX to manage vegetation clearance outside of significant natural areas to protect maintain indigenous biodiversity.	Defer to Hearing Stream 11	
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.394	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Support in part	<p>Notes land in this zone contains high ecological and other values. While some areas within this zone will have vegetation removal rules applying because of the SNA overlay, there do not appear to be any other restrictions on vegetation clearance in this zone.</p> <p>We have sought a general vegetation clearance rule in the ECO chapter, outside of SNAs. It seems particularly important in this zone to have such a rule. Amend rules to include a general vegetation clearance rule, or alternatively place vegetation clearance limits on the PAs currently in this chapter, in order to protect and maintain indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>We also seek a policy in this chapter to protect biodiversity and vegetation values outside SNAs.</p>	Amend all rules in NOSZ (Natural Open Space Zone) chapter to include vegetation clearance limits on Permitted activities to protect and maintain indigenous biodiversity.	Defer to Hearing Stream 11	
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.395	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Support in part	We also seek a policy in this chapter to protect biodiversity and vegetation values outside SNAs.	Add new policy NOSZ-PX to protect biodiversity and vegetation values outside significant natural areas.	Defer to Hearing Stream 11	
John Bryce	354.2	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Amend	<p>Considers that if SNAs are to be on residential properties, there should be a comprehensive and meaningful strategy to incentivize willing private participation in the rezoning of residential areas to SNA. These properties should have significant natural features and not just be any area observed on an aerial photograph to be covered in native plants, such as serial Mahoe. SNAs originally proposed for private residential property represented less than 2% of Wellington's SNAs. If WCC incentives are sufficient to outweigh loss of property rights caused by the imposition of SNAs on residential property, then "most people" will willingly participate in the SNAs process, while the remaining ratepayers who do not agree with the imposition of SNA designation on their property, would represent a tiny portion of the total SNAs in Wellington.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that if Significant Natural Areas are to apply to private residentially zoned land, incentives should be offered to incentivise willing private participation in the rezoning of residential areas to Significant Natural Areas.	Defer to Hearing Stream 11	
John Bryce	354.3	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Support	<p>Considers that natural environmental feature identified as being of genuine "National Significance" on private property should not be designated an SNA without willing consent of the landowner. Private individuals should not be made to bear the cost of the public benefit of SNA against their will.</p>	Supports that Significant Natural Areas do not apply to private residentially zoned land without landowners' consent.	Defer to Hearing Stream 11	

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
John Bryce	354.4	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that if Significant Natural Areas are to be imposed, site coverage rules be put in place to limit buildings to a maximum allowable percentage of a residential site include any Significant Natural Area in the total area of the site.	Defer to Hearing Stream 11	
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.498	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Oppose	Opposes NOSZ (Natural Open Space Zone) zoning in the area on the Sea Wall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and seeks that it is rezoned.  The area of Natural Open Space zoned land located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be rezoned to an alternative land use zone which more accurately reflects the existing environment, including the significant hard engineering structures which currently protect Moa Point Road, the wastewater treatment network and Wellington International Airport from the effects of coastal erosion; or,  A bespoke planning framework be inserted into the Natural Open Space Zone chapter that recognises the role and function of seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and provide for its ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NOSZ (Natural Open Space Zone) zoning in the area on the Sea Wall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and seeks that it is rezoned.	Reject	No
Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand Inc *Late further submission accepted as per Minute 3	FS139.153	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Support	Support WAIL's submission for the reasons set out in WAIL's submission.	Allow	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.499	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / General NOSZ	Oppose	Considers that the Sewall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point is important infrastructure but is not captured within the definition of "Infrastructure" and therefore any maintenance upgrading repair, replacement or development of seawall does not engage infrastructure provisions of the PDP but rather the Natural Open Space Zone.  Submitter questions the efficiency and effectiveness of the Natural Open Space zoning and the associated planning framework insofar as it relates to this area.  [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that an alternative land use zoning is applied to the site that more appropriately recognises the surrounding environment the seawall sits within.	Reject	No
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.66	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / New NOSZ	Amend	Considers it appropriate that there is policy recognition of other activities. This could be achieved through amendment to P4 and provision of a new policy. The Natural Open Space zone is of relevance to Horokiwi as it adjoins the existing quarry to the west. Horokiwi is exploring options for expansion and wishes to ensure that the policy and rule framework within the adjoining zone provides some consenting pathway.	Insert a new policy as follows:  <u>NZOS-P4a Other activities</u> <u>Enable other activities within the zone where they have regional benefits.</u>	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.500	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / New NOSZ	Amend	The area of Natural Open Space zoned land located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be rezoned to an alternative land use zone which more accurately reflects the existing environment, including the significant hard engineering structures which currently protect Moa Point Road, the wastewater treatment network and Wellington International Airport from the effects of coastal erosion; or,  A bespoke planning framework be inserted into the Natural Open Space Zone chapter that recognises the role and function of seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and provide for its ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Add new objective to NOSZ chapter as follows:  <u>NOSZ-O5 Protecting Regionally Significant Infrastructure</u>  <u>Recognise that the Natural Open Space Zone, between Lyall Bay and Moa Point, contains a significant hard engineering structures designed to protect regionally significant infrastructure from coastal erosion, and provide for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade of such structures.</u>  (Option B).	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.501	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / New NOSZ	Amend	The area of Natural Open Space zoned land located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be rezoned to an alternative land use zone which more accurately reflects the existing environment, including the significant hard engineering structures which currently protect Moa Point Road, the wastewater treatment network and Wellington International Airport from the effects of coastal erosion; or,  A bespoke planning framework be inserted into the Natural Open Space Zone chapter that recognises the role and function of seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and provide for its ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Add new policy to NOSZ chapter as follows:  <u>NOSZ P8 Enabling seawalls that protect regionally significant infrastructure between Lyall Bay and Moa Point</u>  <u>Enable the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade of the sea wall and associated activities between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</u>  (Option B).	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.502	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / New NOSZ	Amend	<p>The area of Natural Open Space zoned land located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be rezoned to an alternative land use zone which more accurately reflects the existing environment, including the significant hard engineering structures which currently protect Moa Point Road, the wastewater treatment network and Wellington International Airport from the effects of coastal erosion; or,</p> <p>A bespoke planning framework be inserted into the Natural Open Space Zone chapter that recognises the role and function of seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and provide for its ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add new policy to NOSZ chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>NOSZ-P9 Adverse effects of seawall construction, alteration and additions</u></p> <p><u>Manage the adverse effects of construction, alterations and additions to the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point, including effects on:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>1. Natural and physical resources;</u></li> <li><u>2. Amenity values;</u></li> <li><u>3. The identified values of Overlays;</u></li> <li><u>4. The safe and efficient operation of other infrastructure; and</u></li> <li><u>5. The health, well-being and safety of people and communities.</u></li> </ol> <p>(Option B).</p>	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.503	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / New NOSZ	Amend	<p>The area of Natural Open Space zoned land located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be rezoned to an alternative land use zone which more accurately reflects the existing environment, including the significant hard engineering structures which currently protect Moa Point Road, the wastewater treatment network and Wellington International Airport from the effects of coastal erosion; or,</p> <p>A bespoke planning framework be inserted into the Natural Open Space Zone chapter that recognises the role and function of seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and provide for its ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add new rule to NOSZ chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>NOSZ-R12 Construction, maintenance, alteration, addition, and upgrade of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>1. Activity Status: Permitted</u></li> </ol>	Accept in part	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.504	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / New NOSZ	Amend	<p>The area of Natural Open Space zoned land located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be rezoned to an alternative land use zone which more accurately reflects the existing environment, including the significant hard engineering structures which currently protect Moa Point Road, the wastewater treatment network and Wellington International Airport from the effects of coastal erosion; or,</p> <p>A bespoke planning framework be inserted into the Natural Open Space Zone chapter that recognises the role and function of seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and provide for its ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add new rule to NOSZ chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>NZSO-R15 Alteration and addition to existing seawalls (including construction).</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u></li> </ol> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>a. Compliance with the Standard NOSZ-S6 is met.</u></li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u></li> </ol> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>a. Compliance with NOSZ-R15.1 is not met.</u></li> </ol> <p><u>Matters of discretion are:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>1. The matters in NZSO-P9.</u></li> </ol>	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.505	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / New NOSZ	Amend	<p>The area of Natural Open Space zoned land located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point should be rezoned to an alternative land use zone which more accurately reflects the existing environment, including the significant hard engineering structures which currently protect Moa Point Road, the wastewater treatment network and Wellington International Airport from the effects of coastal erosion; or,</p> <p>A bespoke planning framework be inserted into the Natural Open Space Zone chapter that recognises the role and function of seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point and provide for its ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrade.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Add new standard to NOSZ chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>NOSZ-S6 Seawall structures between Lyall Bay and Moa Point</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>1. Maintenance, repair, upgrade construction, addition and alteration to the seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>a. Any addition shall add no more than 1m in vertical projection to the structure, as it existed on the date on [insert date plan is made operative].</u></li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p><u>Assessment criteria where the standard is not met:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>1. The extent to which the additional height is necessary to provide for functional needs or operational needs of the activities on the site; and</u></li> <li><u>2. Whether topographical or other site constraints make compliance with the standard impractical.</u></li> <li><u>3. The importance of protecting the adjacent regionally significant infrastructure.</u></li> </ol>	Accept in part	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.131	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / New NOSZ	Amend	<p>Considers that building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor.</p> <p>Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin the natural open space zone which does not currently include provision for boundary setbacks for buildings and structures.</p> <p>KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures, and that the rail corridor be recognised as a qualifying matter in relevant non-residential zones in accordance with section 77(1)(o) of the RMA.</p> <p>Consistent with the amendment requested for the assessment criteria in the residential zones, KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor.</p>	<p>Add new standard as follows:</p> <p><u>NOSZ-SX:</u>  <u>Boundary setbacks.</u>  <u>Buildings or structures must not be located within a 5m setback from a rail corridor boundary.</u></p> <p>AND seeks that as applicable, the following matter of discretion be inserted:</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion:</u>  <u>(X) The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u></p>	Accept in part	Yes
Kilmарston Developments Limited and Kilmарston Properties Limited	290.63	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O1	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that provisions limit the ability for the applicant to install a reservoir to service the site and the wider Ngaio area. The submitter notes that their subdivision consent includes the location of a reservoir within the proposed NOSZ.</p>	<p>Seeks amendments to permit reservoir in Natural Open Space Zone.</p> <p>[inferred decision requested]</p>	Reject	No
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.5	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O1	Oppose	<p>Opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. Barry Cottier has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. He has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 Barry Cottier proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.</p>	Accept	No
Jo McKenzie	FS64.5	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O1	Oppose	<p>Jo McKenzie opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. The original submitter has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding.</p> <p>Jo McKenzie considers that original submitter has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 the original submitter proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.</p>	<p>Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.</p>	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.31	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O1	Oppose	<p>Forest &amp; Bird does not support amendments to broadly permit reservoir construction in Natural Open Space Zone. If this submitter seeks to build such a utility, then it should be subject to a private plan change or similar open process. Amending districtwide provisions is not appropriate when the submitter is seeking to construct a reservoir in a specific location.</p>	<p>Disallow</p>	Accept	No
Andy Foster	FS86.54	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O1	Support	<p>Considers that it is reasonable to allow a reservoir to be constructed on the rural – Open Space part of the land to service new development and existing surrounding suburbs. Care should be taken about how it is designed to fit in with the landform, landscape and vegetation.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].                      [Inferred reference to 290.63]</p>	<p>Allow</p>	Reject	No
Kilmарston Developments Limited and Kilmарston Properties Limited	290.64	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O1	Amend	<p>Considers that provisions limit the ability for the applicant to install a reservoir to service the site and the wider Ngaio area. The submitter notes that their subdivision consent includes the location of a reservoir within the proposed NOSZ.</p>	<p>Seeks that NOSZ-O1 (Purpose) is amended to include wording for appropriate infrastructure to be located within the Natural Open Space Zone.</p> <p>[inferred decision requested]</p>	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.6	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-01	Oppose	Opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. Barry Cottier has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. He has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 Barry Cottier proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.	Accept	No
Jo McKenzie	FS64.6	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-01	Oppose	Jo McKenzie opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. The original submitter has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding.  Jo McKenzie considers that original submitter has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 the original submitter proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.32	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-01	Oppose	Forest & Bird does not support amendments to broadly permit reservoir construction in Natural Open Space Zone. If this submitter seeks to build such a utility, then it should be subject to a private plan change or similar open process. Amending districtwide provisions is not appropriate when the submitter is seeking to construct a reservoir in a specific location.	Disallow	Accept	No
Andy Foster	FS86.55	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-01	Support	Considers that it is reasonable to allow a reservoir to be constructed on the rural – Open Space part of the land to service new development and existing surrounding suburbs. Care should be taken about how it is designed to fit in with the landform, landscape and vegetation.  [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to 290.63]	Allow	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.482	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-01	Amend	Considers it appropriate to include wording to seek that natural open space areas are managed in a way so as to improve water quality and enhance habitat recognising that many of these areas include 'green' and 'blue' corridors of importance to Wellington City	Amend NOSZ-01 (Purpose) as follows: Natural open space areas are <u>predominantly</u> used by the public for informal recreation activities, within un-developed natural areas, in such a way that protects, and where possible enhances, <u>water quality and biodiversity</u> and the predominant character and amenity values of the Natural Open Space Zone which include: .....	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.506	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-01	Oppose	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NOSZ-01 (Purpose) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.507	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-01	Amend	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NOSZ-01 (Purpose) is amended to make an exemption for the area of the seawall and associated structures above mean high water springs between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.508	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-01	Amend	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NOSZ-01 (Purpose) is amended to enable the maintenance, repair and upgrading of the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Reject	No



Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Kilmарston Developments Limited and Kilmарston Properties Limited	290.65	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O2	Support in part	<p>Considers that it is important that proposed NOSZ is introduced to protect the recreational, natural, landscape and ecological values of the Open Space areas that the Submitter owns.</p> <p>The Submitter currently permits access onto his land for informal recreation by the public. The land holding provide informal connections from Ngaio to Crow’s Nest and the Skyline Walkway– both of which are entirely located within the proposed NOSZ.</p> <p>The Submitter considers this zoning on the balance of the Submitters land acceptable, subject to agreement being reached by WCC with Submitter on the appropriate tenure of the land.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	No relief sought.	Reject	No
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.13	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O2	Oppose	<p>Considers that while Kilmарston Development’s support of the NOSZ is commendable for the SW area of their land, the zoning should not and cannot be conditional on appropriate tenure arrangements. The NOSZ zoning is entirely in keeping with the land’s very high biodiversity values. It has some of the best examples of native forest in Wellington with mature podocarps such as matai, miro and totara interspersed in mature tawa and kohekohe forest. The natural values here are incredibly high and support a widening variety of resident native birds such as kakariki, kaka, kereru and occasionally bellbird (korimako). These values were recognised in the conditions of the environment court consents and the local community are well aware of the special nature of this land. While the community is very appreciative of being able to use the land over the years, it is inappropriate to suggest zoning of this sort is conditions on the land being purchased by WCC. Much of this land is already zoned Open Space B so the proposed District Plan is merely translating this existing status to its new equivalent.</p>	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that suggests tying the NOSZ zoning to the future tenure of the land. The proposed zoning should be retained as unconditional for the area as mapped and currently Open Space B.	Accept	No
Jo McKenzie	FS64.13	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O2	Oppose	<p>Considers that while Kilmарston Development’s support of the NOSZ is commendable for the SW area of their land, the zoning should not and cannot be conditional on appropriate tenure arrangements. The NOSZ zoning is entirely in keeping with the land’s very high biodiversity values. It has some of the best examples of native forest in Wellington with mature podocarps such as matai, miro and totara interspersed in mature tawa and kohekohe forest. The natural values here are incredibly high and support a widening variety of resident native birds such as kakariki, kaka, kereru and occasionally bellbird (korimako). These values were recognised in the conditions of the environment court consents and the local community are well aware of the special nature of this land. Considers that while the community is very appreciative of being able to use the land over the years, it is inappropriate to suggest zoning of this sort is conditions on the land being purchased by WCC. Much of this land is already zoned Open Space B so the proposed District Plan is merely translating this existing status to its new equivalent.</p>	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that suggests tying the NOSZ zoning to the future tenure of the land. The proposed zoning should be retained as unconditional for the area mapped and currently Open Space B.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.483	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O2	Amend	<p>Considers it appropriate to include wording to seek that adverse effects are not ‘managed effectively’ but rather, avoided, remedied or mitigated: this provides a clearer signal as to the importance of environmental protection of these areas as part of providing for their character and amenity.</p>	Amend NOSZ-O2 (Managing effects) as follows: Adverse effects of activities undertaken in the Natural Open Space Zone at the zone interface and surrounding area are <u>avoided, remedied or mitigated</u> .	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.509	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O2	Oppose	<p>Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes NOSZ-O2 (Managing effects) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.510	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O2	Amend	<p>Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that NOSZ-O2 (Managing effects) is amended to make an exemption for the area of the seawall and associated structures above mean high water springs between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.511	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O2	Amend	<p>Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</p> <p>[See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that NOSZ-O2 (Managing effects) is amended to enable the maintenance, repair and upgrading of the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Reject	No
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.106	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-O3	Support in part	<p>Supports NOSZ-O3 (Mana whenua) in principle.</p>	Retain NOSZ-O3 (Mana whenua) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	No
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.67	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P1	Not specified	<p>Considers that if amendments sought in relation to NOSZ-P4 are not accepted, than NOSZ-P1 be amended to recognise other activities. On the basis policy NOSZ-P4 is amended to recognise other activities, Horokiwi is neutral on policy NOSZ-P1.</p>	Seeks that NOSZ-P1 (Enabled activities) is amended to recognise other activities, if amendments to NOSZ-P4 (Potentially compatible activities) are not accepted.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.484	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P1	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity; enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain NOSZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.512	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P1	Oppose	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NOSZ-P1 (Enabled Activities) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.513	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P1	Amend	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NOSZ-P1 (Enabled Activities) is amended to make an exemption for the area of the seawall and associated structures above mean high water springs between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.514	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P1	Amend	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point. [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NOSZ-P1 (Enabled Activities) is amended to enable the maintenance, repair and upgrading of the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.485	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P2	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity; enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain NOSZ-P2 (Small scale mobile commercial activities) as notified.	Accept	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.486	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P3	Amend	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity; recognising that some reserves may have as part of their purpose provision for rural activities, this policy is appropriate. However given the freshwater quality issues the City must urgently address, and the importance the city and its communities are putting on enhancement of native biodiversity, we seek that this policy be reworded to specifically require a focus on water quality and biodiversity.	Amend NOSZ-P3 (Rural activities) as follows: Only allow rural activities such as grazing or forestry where they are part of a management programme identified in the relevant reserve management plan for the area, <u>and where specific provision is made to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on freshwater and native biodiversity.</u>	Reject	No
Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.68	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Amend	Considers it appropriate that there is policy recognition of other activities. This could be achieved through amendment to P4 and provision of a new policy. The Natural Open Space zone is of relevance to Horokiwi as it adjoins the existing quarry to the west. Horokiwi is exploring options for expansion and wishes to ensure that the policy and rule framework within the adjoining zone provides some consenting pathway.	Amend Policy NOSZ-P4 (Potentially compatible activities) as follows: <del>Only allow</del> other activities to establish where it can be demonstrated that they are compatible with the purpose, character and amenity values of the zone, having regard to whether: ...	Reject	No
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.66	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Oppose in part	Considers that provisions limit the ability for the applicant to install a reservoir to service the site and the wider Ngaio area. The submitter notes that their subdivision consent includes the location of a reservoir within the proposed NOSZ.	Seeks that NOSZ-P4 (Potentially compatible activities) is amended to include wording for appropriate infrastructure to be located within the Natural Open Space Zone.  [inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.7	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Oppose	Opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. Barry Cottier has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. He has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 Barry Cottier proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.	Accept	No
Jo McKenzie	FS64.7	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Oppose	Jo McKenzie opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. The original submitter has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding.  Jo McKenzie considers that original submitter has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 the original submitter proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.33	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Oppose	Forest & Bird does not support amendments to broadly permit reservoir construction in Natural Open Space Zone. If this submitter seeks to build such a utility, then it should be subject to a private plan change or similar open process. Amending districtwide provisions is not appropriate when the submitter is seeking to construct a reservoir in a specific location.	Disallow	Accept	No
Andy Foster	FS86.56	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Support	Considers that it is reasonable to allow a reservoir to be constructed on the rural – Open Space part of the land to service new development and existing surrounding suburbs. Care should be taken about how it is designed to fit in with the landform, landscape and vegetation.  [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to 290.63]	Allow	Reject	No
Kilmarnock Developments Limited and Kilmarnock Properties Limited	290.67	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Amend	Considers that provisions limit the ability for the applicant to install a reservoir to service the site and the wider Ngaio area. The submitter notes that their subdivision consent includes the location of a reservoir within the proposed NOSZ.	Seeks that NOSZ-O1 is amended to include wording for appropriate infrastructure to be located within the Natural Open Space Zone.  [inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.8	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Oppose	Opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. Barry Cottier has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. He has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 Barry Cottier proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.	Accept	No
Jo McKenzie	FS64.8	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Oppose	Jo McKenzie opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. The original submitter has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding.  Jo McKenzie considers that original submitter has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 the original submitter proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.	Accept	No
Andy Foster	FS86.57	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Support	Considers that it is reasonable to allow a reservoir to be constructed on the rural – Open Space part of the land to service new development and existing surrounding suburbs. Care should be taken about how it is designed to fit in with the landform, landscape and vegetation.  [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to 290.67]	Allow	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.487	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity; enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain NOSZ-P4 (Potentially compatible activities) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.515	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Oppose	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NOSZ-P4 (Potentially compatible activities) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.516	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Amend	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NOSZ-P4 (Potentially compatible activities) is amended to make an exemption for the area of the seawall and associated structures above mean high water springs between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.517	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P4	Amend	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NOSZ-P4 (Potentially compatible activities) is amended to enable the maintenance, repair and upgrading of the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.68	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Oppose in part	Considers that provisions limit the ability for the applicant to install a reservoir to service the site and the wider Ngaio area. The submitter notes that their subdivision consent includes the location of a reservoir within the proposed NOSZ.	Seeks that NOSZ-P5 (Enabled buildings and structures) is amended to include wording for appropriate infrastructure to be located within the Natural Open Space Zone.  [inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.9	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Oppose	Opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. Barry Cottier has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. He has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 Barry Cottier proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.	Accept	No
Jo McKenzie	FS64.9	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Oppose	Jo McKenzie opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. The original submitter has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding.  Jo McKenzie considers that original submitter has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 the original submitter proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.34	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Oppose	Forest & Bird does not support amendments to broadly permit reservoir construction in Natural Open Space Zone. If this submitter seeks to build such a utility, then it should be subject to a private plan change or similar open process. Amending districtwide provisions is not appropriate when the submitter is seeking to construct a reservoir in a specific location.	Disallow	Accept	No
Andy Foster	FS86.58	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Support	Considers that it is reasonable to allow a reservoir to be constructed on the rural – Open Space part of the land to service new development and existing surrounding suburbs. Care should be taken about how it is designed to fit in with the landform, landscape and vegetation.  [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to 290.68]	Allow	Reject	No
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.69	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Amend	Considers that provisions limit the ability for the applicant to install a reservoir to service the site and the wider Ngaio area. The submitter notes that their subdivision consent includes the location of a reservoir within the proposed NOSZ.	Seeks that NOSZ-P5 (Enabled buildings and structures) is amended to include wording for appropriate infrastructure to be located within the Natural Open Space Zone.  [inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.10	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Oppose	Opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. Barry Cottier has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding. He has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous land use consents had lapsed. In 2019 Barry Cottier proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow that part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Jo McKenzie	FS64.10	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Oppose	Jo McKenzie opposes modifying the NOSZ in the way proposed as a reservoir of the size planned is completely out of scale and nature of the proposed zoning which is designed to protect the high amenity values of land surrounding Crows Nest. The original submitter has had previous consents for land use and subdivisions that resulted from a controversial environment court proceeding.  Jo McKenzie considers that original submitter has failed to act on those consents and they have lapsed. A Code of Compliance issued earlier in 2022 for clearance of all vegetation from previously planned earthworks areas was issued by Council on the basis that previous landuse consents had lapsed. In 2019 the original submitter proposed a complete rework of the earthworks and subdivision plan to garner council support for extending the consents, that did not feature any reservoir. A master plan process was promised but has not been actioned.	Disallow / Disallow the part of the submission that seeks to enable a large reservoir to be built in a NOSZ or on land that is proposed to be NOSZ.	Accept	No
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.35	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Oppose	Forest & Bird does not support amendments to broadly permit reservoir construction in Natural Open Space Zone. If this submitter seeks to build such a utility, then it should be subject to a private plan change or similar open process. Amending districtwide provisions is not appropriate when the submitter is seeking to construct a reservoir in a specific location.	Disallow	Accept	No
Andy Foster	FS86.59	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Support	Considers that it is reasonable to allow a reservoir to be constructed on the rural – Open Space part of the land to service new development and existing surrounding suburbs. Care should be taken about how it is designed to fit in with the landform, landscape and vegetation.  [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to 290.69]	Allow	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.488	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity; enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain NOSZ-P5 (Enabled buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.518	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Oppose	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NOSZ-P5 (Enabled buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.519	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Amend	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NOSZ-P5 (Enabled buildings and structures) is amended to make an exemption for the area of the seawall and associated structures above mean high water springs between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.520	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P5	Amend	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NOSZ-P5 (Enabled buildings and structures) is amended to enable the maintenance, repair and upgrading of the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.489	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P6	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity; enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain NOSZ-P6 (Potentially compatible buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.521	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P6	Oppose	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NOSZ-P6 (Potentially compatible buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.522	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P6	Amend	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NOSZ-P6 (Potentially compatible buildings and structures) is amended to make an exemption for the area of the seawall and associated structures above mean high water springs between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.523	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P6	Amend	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NOSZ-P6 (Potentially compatible buildings and structures) is amended to enable the maintenance, repair and upgrading of the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Reject	No
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.490	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P7	Support	Considers open space areas are areas of recreation and activity; enabling activities consistent with the purpose of these areas is part of enabling their cultural and amenity value.	Retain NOSZ-P7 (Mana whenua) as notified.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.107	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-P7	Support in part	Supports NOSZ-P7 (Mana whenua)	Retain NOSZ-P7 (Mana whenua) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	No
Horokivi Quarries Ltd	271.69	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-R11	Support	Supports the discretionary activity status within Rule NOSZ-R11.	Retain NOSZ-R11 ( Any other activity not otherwise provided for as a permitted activity) as notified.	Accept	No
Ministry of Education	400.149	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-R11	Support	Supports NOSZ-R11. Considering the specific purpose of the NOSZ, the submitter generally supports the activity status of Discretionary for educational facilities.	Retain NOSZ-R11 (Any other activity not otherwise provided for as a permitted activity) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.524	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-R11	Oppose	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes NOSZ-R11 (Any other activity not provided for as a permitted activity) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.525	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-R11	Amend	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NOSZ-R11 (Any other activity not provided for as a permitted activity) is amended to exclude the area of the seawall and associated structures above mean high water springs between Lyall Bay and Moa Point	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.526	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-R11	Amend	Opposes this provision as they create an unduly onerous consenting pathway for the ongoing maintenance, repair and upgrading of the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Seeks that NOSZ-R11 (Any other activity not provided for as a permitted activity) is amended to enable the maintenance, repair and upgrading of the existing seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.286	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-R12	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain NOSZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.287	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-R12	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend NOSZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.	Reject	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.527	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-R12	Support	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition, removal, maintenance and repair of structures, such as sea walls, within the Natural Open Space Zone.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Retain NOSZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified, subject to adoption of submitters other submission points.	Accept in part	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.528	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-R13	Support	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition, removal, maintenance and repair of structures, such as sea walls, within the Natural Open Space Zone.  [See paragraphs 4.40 to 4.45 of original submission for full reason]	Retain NOSZ-R13 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified, subject to adoption of submitters other submission points.	Accept in part	No
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.529	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-R14	Support in part	Supports this rule in part.  Considers that a further amendment is required to ensure that the rule does not inadvertently capture the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Supports NOSZ-R14 (Construction, alteration of and addition to buildings and structures) in part and seeks amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.530	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-R14	Amend	Supports this rule in part.  Considers that a further amendment is required to ensure that the rule does not inadvertently capture the seawall between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Amend NOSZ-R14 (Construction, alteration of and addition to buildings and structures) as follows:  NOSZ-R14 Construction, alteration of and addition to buildings and structures <u>(excluding seawalls)</u>  ...	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.531	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-S1	Support in part	Supports this rule in part.  Submits that a further amendment is required to ensure that the standards appropriately provide for the height of seawall structures between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Supports NOSZ-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.532	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-S1	Amend	Supports this rule in part.  Submits that a further amendment is required to ensure that the standards appropriately provide for the height of seawall structures between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Amend NOSZ-S1 (Maximum height of buildings and structures) as follows:  NOSZ-S1 Maximum height of buildings and structures <u>(excluding seawalls)</u>  1. Buildings and structures <u>(excluding seawalls)</u> must not exceed the following maximum height limits above ground level.	Accept in part	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.533	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-S2	Oppose	Opposes this rule in part.  Submits that a further amendment is required to ensure that the standards appropriately provide for the height of seawall structures between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Opposes NOSZ-S2 (Maximum Gross Floor Area) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.534	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-S2	Amend	Supports this rule in part.  Submits that a further amendment is required to ensure that the standards appropriately provide for the height of seawall structures between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Amend NOSZ-S2 (Maximum Gross Floor Area) as follows:  NOSZ-S2 Maximum gross floor area  1. ....  This standard does not apply to: a. Additions and alterations to existing buildings at Karori Wildlife Sanctuary (Zealandia, Legal Description Lot 1 DP 313319). b. <u>The maintenance, repair, upgrade, construction, addition or alteration to the seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</u>  ...	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.535	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-S3	Oppose	Opposes this rule in part.  Submits that a further amendment is required to ensure that the standards appropriately provide for the height of seawall structures between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Opposes NOSZ-S3 (Maximum Building Coverage) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part	Yes
Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.536	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Natural Open Space Zone / NOSZ-S3	Amend	Supports this rule in part.  Submits that a further amendment is required to ensure that the standards appropriately provide for the height of seawall structures between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.	Amend NOSZ-S3 (Maximum Building Coverage) as follows:  NOSZ-S3 Maximum building coverage  1. Maximum building coverage is 5%  This standard does not apply to: a. <u>The maintenance, repair, upgrade, construction, addition or alteration to the seawall located between Lyall Bay and Moa Point.</u>	Accept in part	Yes

Original Sub Number	Further Submitter Name	Further Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
389	Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.1	Oppose	<p>The further submitter seeks that the changes sought particularly in relation to Shelly Bay and Watts Peninsula in the submission be disallowed.</p> <p>This submission is primarily directed at the changes sought in relation to Shelly Bay and Watts Peninsula, which concern EMPI. There is also a request to be allowed to create papakainga in Open Space and Rural land and on Ridgeline and Hilltop and Special Amenity Landscape that may cause concern, because there is no definition of what papakainga might look like, for example in relation to size, height etc.</p> <p>Shelly Bay and Watts Peninsula are very significant areas of land and hugely valued by the local community. The planning rules must allow the community to be fully involved in planning for their future, and the submission by Taranaki Whānui would limit this ability. The submission from Taranaki Whānui would remove all protections, many of them long standing and uncontested for decades, from these important areas of land, and make community involvement much less likely and/or limit the need for community involvement. The planning rules must allow the community to be fully involved in planning for their future. On that basis, the submission on behalf of Taranaki Whānui is opposed. EMPI expects that the local community will welcome an engagement first process, which would be followed by changing planning rules as appropriate (through a Plan Change) with community support.</p>	Disallow	Accept	No
290	Orienteering Wellington	FS32.1	Support	<p>Submitter has restricted this submission to areas of relevance to Orienteering Wellington, and does not feel competent to reflect on some of the wider aspects of the plan and submission 290. It is their understanding that the submission includes a proposal to build medium density housing within the original submitters land interest, and retain a further block designated as an NOSZ. The area being proposed to be an NOSZ includes land that they have been provided access to for orienteering events by Kilmarnon Developments. This area, which is adjacent to the Huntleigh Reserve has high value to our organisation in its natural state. It has potential to be a significant asset to the local community. Submitter notes the "Reasons" (section B, page 6 of the submission) text recognises the value of linkages in this area and a Willingness to enter dialogue over mechanisms to support both the NOSZ and residential uses of this land. They support this. Arrangements that allow for careful development, enhancement of linkages to other public land and tracks, and retention of the natural value of the reserve-adjacent land would benefit the community, and specifically ourselves as an orienteering club providing outdoor experiences to residents of the area. Submitter notes that the submission also includes a request to provide for installation of a water reservoir within the land identified as NOSZ. The specifics of the land designations that permit or hinder this are not within my competency. Considers that use of the proposed NOSZ area is unlikely to be unduly compromised by the presence of such a reservoir, and to note that with appropriate design, there may be access and linkage benefits from track infrastructure required for installation and maintenance of the reservoir. The reaching of agreement as described in "Reasons" section B (page 6 of submission) is far preferable to our organization that the alternative proposed in section C (bottom of page 6).</p>	Allow	Reject	No
290	Hadleigh Petherick	FS56.1	Support	<p>Support and agree with the overall intent of the submission which will achieve a clear delineation between environmental outcomes (i.e. residential development and special amenity landscapes) and provide access and linkages to spaces identified as Natural Open Space Zone. The submission recognises the strategic importance of providing community infrastructure and housing on the basis that the appropriate planning framework is applied over the submitters land. Accepting the submission gives the best chance at securing land and open space networks for the community.</p>	Allow the submission in its entirety.	Reject	No
290	Spencer Wade Petherick	FS58.1	Support	<p>Support and agree with the overall intent of the submission which will achieve a clear delineation between environmental outcomes (i.e. residential development and special amenity landscapes) and provide access and linkages to spaces identified as Natural Open Space Zone. The submission recognises the strategic importance of providing community infrastructure and housing on the basis that the appropriate planning framework is applied over the submitters land. Accepting the submission gives the best chance at securing land and open space networks for the community.</p>	Allow the submission in its entirety.	Reject	No



Original Sub Number	Further Submitter Name	Further Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
290	Emily Nash	FS65.1	Oppose	Much of this SW area of land would be part of a reserve contribution for the medium density residential development of a portion of the land on Ngaio facing slopes. But more importantly, this land hosts some of best examples of native forest in Wellington with mature podocarps such as matai, miro and totara interspersed in mature tawa and kohekohe forest. The natural values here are incredibly high and support a widening variety of resident native birds such as kakariki, kaka, kereru and occasionally bellbird (korimako). Kilmarston Developments are also seeking to have a large reservoir permitted to be built in the Natural Open Space zone to support his development. This is despite that aspect of his development being dropped from revised concept plans submitted to Greater Wellington in 2019 to justify extending resource consents. Original consent plans had this reservoir positioned on slopes facing Crofton Downs above the walking track to Crows Nest. It is unclear where it would now be located as a revised subdivision plan or master plan process has not been undertaken.	Disallow the submission in its entirety.	Accept	No
290	Carol Anderson	FS67.1	Oppose	Status quo should remain with the Special Amenity Landscape and no permission for the infrastructure within the Natural open Space Zone. Impacts will be to remove regenerating native forest which provides part of a corridor for fauna from Zealandia to Mt Kaukau. Major impact on storm water flows into streams in the valleys (Awarua catchment and Silverstream). Possible introduction of land instability. No mention of upgrade to lower suburb water infrastructure. Crumbling water infrastructure for 100 year old water pipes (ref. water leak complaints).	Disallow the submission in its entirety.	Accept	No
290	Serah Allison	FS115.1	Oppose	The green area above Silverstream Road to the North East, and above Ngaio to the North West, is a beautiful area of regenerating native bushland. It features several small waterways, and the environment as it is enjoyed by many Wellington residents from the nearby suburbs and from further away around the city, including both children and adults. Kaka from the Zealandia sanctuary have been spending increasing amounts of time in the Crofton Downs and Ngaio suburbs due to this bushland, and signs erected within the bushland suggest some Kaka are even nesting there. Further Submitter grew up in Crofton Downs, and many of their family still live in that area and feel a strong connection with these hills, the bushland, and the streams. Hope future generations will also be able to collectively and freely experience the joy of exploring undisturbed bushland and the wildlife within it across the entirety of the area Submission 290 proposes to develop.	Seeks that Wellington City Council reject any moves to develop housing or other buildings or infrastructure in the area described in section 2.1 of submission 290. This includes felling any existing trees and bush. Acknowledging the housing challenges in Wellington City, Suggest the Council direct developers including the submitter 290 towards densification projects rather than increasing urban sprawl, decreasing green areas, and constructing new reservoirs.	Accept in part	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.15	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / General SARZ	Amend	The NOSZ chapter should be amended to allow for more permissive rules related to campgrounds. Allowing for more permissive rules around the establishment of campgrounds will make it easier to establish sites for vehicle-based camping in the Wellington District. Campgrounds can easily meet the objectives, policies and intention of this zone.	Seeks that the SARZ (Sports and Active Recreation Zone) chapter be amended to allow for more permissive rules related to campgrounds.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.416	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / General SARZ	Support in part	Supports, with amendments.	Supports the Sport and Active Recreation Zone chapter, with amendments.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.417	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / General SARZ	Amend	Considers some of the activities permitted in this chapter have the potential to generate significant traffic and have a significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network if not managed appropriately. As trip generation is proposed to be managed in the traffic chapter, specific reference should be included to that chapter. Permitted rules in this chapter should be also required to comply with the trip generation rules in the transport chapter. The submitter is seeking a permitted trip generation threshold of 100 equivalent car movements per day for any activity accessed from the state highway.	Seeks to add a note to the Sport and Active Recreation Zone chapter:  <u>All activities in this chapter must comply with the trip generation thresholds in the transport chapter.</u>	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.418	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / SARZ-O2	Support	Supports the inclusion of this objective which requires effects on the surrounding area to be managed effectively.	Retain SARZ-O2 (Managing effects) as notified.	Accept	No
Waka Kotahi	370.419	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / SARZ-P1	Support in part	Supports, with amendments.	Supports, with amendments.	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.420	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / SARZ-P1	Amend	Considers some of the activities permitted in this chapter have the potential to generate significant traffic and have a significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network – particularly those that are of a larger scale or directly access the state highway network. The submitter request that the wording of the policy is amended to include consideration of wider effects on the transport network.	Amend SARZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable a wide range of recreational activities that are compatible with the purpose, character and amenity values of the Sport and Active Recreation Zone, or which enhance the public use and enjoyment of the open space, while ensuring that their scale and intensity is appropriate <u>and adverse effects on the wider environment, including the transport network, are managed.</u>	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.421	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / SARZ-P3	Amend	Considers some of the activities permitted in this chapter have the potential to generate significant traffic and have a significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network – particularly those that are of a larger scale or directly access the state highway network. The submitter request that the wording of the policy is amended to include consideration of wider effects on the transport network.	Amend SARZ-P3 (Potentially compatible activities) as follows: 5. Any maritime activities and associated facilities adjoining the coast or a water body have a functional need or operational need for a coastal location; and 6. Any adverse residential amenity effects will be minimised.; <u>and</u> 7. <u>Effects on the wider environment, including the transport network, are managed.</u>	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.422	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / SARZ-R1	Oppose	Considers that these activities have the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, particularly those of a larger scale, or directly accessing the state highway network.  Traffic generated from events is not considered to be adequately managed through this chapter or through the transport chapter.  Activities in this chapter which exceed 100 equivalent car movements per day where they are accessed from state highway should require a traffic management plan. Permitted rules in this chapter should also be required to comply with the trip generation rules in the transport chapter.  The permitted activity status of these activities is opposed with the trip generation thresholds proposed in the plan as notified.	If activities are to retain permitted activity status: - See submission point on trip generation which Waka Kotahi request are adopted. - Reference to the trip generation thresholds should be included in this chapter – and in the rule table of the activities referenced in this submission point.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Waka Kotahi	370.423	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / SARZ-R2	Oppose	<p>Considers that these activities have the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, particularly those of a larger scale, or directly accessing the state highway network.</p> <p>Traffic generated from events is not considered to be adequately managed through this chapter or through the transport chapter.</p> <p>Activities in this chapter which exceed 100 equivalent car movements per day where they are accessed from state highway should require a traffic management plan. Permitted rules in this chapter should also be required to comply with the trip generation rules in the transport chapter.</p> <p>The permitted activity status of these activities is opposed with the trip generation thresholds proposed in the plan as notified.</p>	<p>If activities are to retain permitted activity status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See submission point on trip generation which Waka Kotahi request are adopted.</li> <li>- Reference to the trip generation thresholds should be included in this chapter – and in the rule table of the activities referenced in this submission point.</li> </ul>	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.424	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / SARZ-R4	Oppose	<p>Considers that these activities have the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, particularly those of a larger scale, or directly accessing the state highway network.</p> <p>Traffic generated from events is not considered to be adequately managed through this chapter or through the transport chapter.</p> <p>Activities in this chapter which exceed 100 equivalent car movements per day where they are accessed from state highway should require a traffic management plan. Permitted rules in this chapter should also be required to comply with the trip generation rules in the transport chapter.</p> <p>The permitted activity status of these activities is opposed with the trip generation thresholds proposed in the plan as notified.</p>	<p>If activities are to retain permitted activity status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See submission point on trip generation which Waka Kotahi request are adopted.</li> <li>- Reference to the trip generation thresholds should be included in this chapter – and in the rule table of the activities referenced in this submission point.</li> </ul>	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.425	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / SARZ-R5	Oppose	<p>Considers that these activities have the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, particularly those of a larger scale, or directly accessing the state highway network.</p> <p>Traffic generated from events is not considered to be adequately managed through this chapter or through the transport chapter.</p> <p>Activities in this chapter which exceed 100 equivalent car movements per day where they are accessed from state highway should require a traffic management plan. Permitted rules in this chapter should also be required to comply with the trip generation rules in the transport chapter.</p> <p>The permitted activity status of these activities is opposed with the trip generation thresholds proposed in the plan as notified.</p>	<p>If activities are to retain permitted activity status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See submission point on trip generation which Waka Kotahi request are adopted. • Reference to the trip generation thresholds should be included in this chapter – and in the rule table of the activities referenced in this submission point.</li> </ul>	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.426	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / SARZ-R5	Oppose	<p>Considers that these activities have the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, particularly those of a larger scale, or directly accessing the state highway network.</p> <p>Traffic generated from events is not considered to be adequately managed through this chapter or through the transport chapter.</p> <p>Activities in this chapter which exceed 100 equivalent car movements per day where they are accessed from state highway should require a traffic management plan. Permitted rules in this chapter should also be required to comply with the trip generation rules in the transport chapter.</p> <p>The permitted activity status of these activities is opposed with the trip generation thresholds proposed in the plan as notified.</p>	<p>If activities are to retain permitted activity status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See submission point on trip generation which Waka Kotahi request are adopted. • Reference to the trip generation thresholds should be included in this chapter – and in the rule table of the activities referenced in this submission point.</li> </ul>	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Waka Kotahi	370.427	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / SARZ-R6	Oppose	<p>Considers that these activities have the potential to have significant impact on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network, particularly those of a larger scale, or directly accessing the state highway network.</p> <p>Traffic generated from events is not considered to be adequately managed through this chapter or through the transport chapter.</p> <p>Activities in this chapter which exceed 100 equivalent car movements per day where they are accessed from state highway should require a traffic management plan. Permitted rules in this chapter should also be required to comply with the trip generation rules in the transport chapter.</p> <p>The permitted activity status of these activities is opposed with the trip generation thresholds proposed in the plan as notified.</p>	<p>If activities are to retain permitted activity status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- See submission point on trip generation which Waka Kotahi request are adopted.</li> <li>- Reference to the trip generation thresholds should be included in this chapter – and in the rule table of the activities referenced in this submission point.</li> </ul>	Reject	No
Waka Kotahi	370.428	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / SARZ-R13	Support	Support discretionary activity status for activities not provided for as this will enable effects to be assessed and managed, including those to the transport network.	Retain SARZ-R13 (Any other activity not otherwise provided for as a Permitted Activity) as notified.	Accept	No
Ministry of Education	400.151	Open Space and Recreation Zones / Sport and Active Recreation Zone / SARZ-R13	Support	Supports SARZ-R13. Considering the specific purpose of the SARZ, the submitter generally supports the activity status of Discretionary for educational facilities.	Retain SARZ-R13 (Any other activity not otherwise provided for as a Permitted Activity) as notified.	Accept	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.22	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / General WTZ	Amend	Considers that remnants of the town belt should be protected to enhance green space and historic elements in these areas, particularly if intensification is to proceed. [Refer to original submission for details]	Seeks provisions to ensure that remnants of the town belt are protected, to enhance green space and historic elements in these areas.	Reject	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.9	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / General WTZ	Support	Supports the intent of the zone. Submitter considers that the green belt is a prominent aspect of Wellington city and provides a strong backdrop to the built environment and a health and wellbeing benefit to residents and visitors to the city.  Submitter considers that identifying the area as WTZ and the provisions for its protection and use promotes the continuation of its value.	Retain the WTZ (Wellington Town Belt Zone) as notified, to ensure the identification and recognition of the Wellington Town Belt in a specific zone.	Accept in part	No
Roseneath Residents' Association	FS49.8	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / General WTZ	Support	Supports the submission of Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton - 401, the submitter supports Ms Harper and Mr Pemberton's submission, because it emphasises how important the 'green belt' is to our city.  The submitter highlights this submission as reflective of the high value that Wellingtonians place on our Town Belt. That underpins the submitter's request that number 22 Alexandra Road retains the Open Space zoning and Ridgeline and Hilltops protection status as it is in the Operative District Plan. [Inferred reference to submission point 401.90]	Allow	Accept in part	No
Matthew Wells, Adelina Reis and Sarah Rennie	FS50.7	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / General WTZ	Support	Supports the submission of Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton - 401, we support Ms Harper and Mr Pemberton's submission, because it emphasises how important the 'green belt' is to our city.  The submitter highlights this submission as reflective of the high value that Wellingtonians place on our Town Belt. That underpins the submitter's request that number 22 Alexandra Road retains the Open Space zoning and Ridgeline and Hilltops protection status as it is in the Operative District Plan. [Inferred reference to submission point 401.90]	Allow	Accept in part	No
Craig Palmer	492.43	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / New WTZ	Amend	Considers that the District Plan needs to be the ultimate bastion of the Town Belt. Recent legislation (Wellington Town Belt Act 2016, and Wellington Town Belt Management Plan June 2018) has diminished the public's awareness of the competing interests over the Town Belt. This unique public treasure has constantly required protection for the retention of free access and enjoyment since its inception in 1983. In particular, for walkers and those seeking quiet passive recreation in semi-wilderness surroundings.	Add a new provision in the Wellington Town Belt Zone chapter to evaluate proposed commercial activities within the Town Belt.  The rules are to be accorded discretionary activity status with mandatory public notification.	Reject	No
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.33	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / New WTZ	Support	The submission is supported. As the Wellington Civic Trust understands it, all commercial activities would "default" to fully discretionary under rule WTZ-R8 and we support that. The plan is however silent on public notification, meaning that the need for notification would be assessed directly under the RMA provisions. Because of the importance of the Town Belt to the public and to future generations, we support the submission that all activities requiring consent (activities and buildings) should be subject to public notification.	Allow	Reject	No
Wellington Civic Trust	388.106	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTZ-O1	Support in part	WTZ-O1 is supported for its purpose. However the purpose of the Zone does not match with the principles of the Town Belt Act.	Retain Objective WTZ-O1 (Purpose) with amendment.	Accept	Yes
Wellington Civic Trust	388.107	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTZ-O1	Amend	Considers that WTZ-O1 should be amended to match its purpose with the principles of the Town Belt Act. It is clear that there are omissions in the stated purpose relating to its landscape significance, its historic and cultural heritage values, and its significance to the City as place with natural ecosystems which need protection and enhancement (extending beyond the recognition of vegetation, which is already mentioned). Many of these aspects are woven through the Town Belt's area and its development over time. While they may not be individually important enough to justification through scheduling or overlays they nevertheless need to be recognised in the Plan as well as in the legislation covering the Council's responsibility for this very important area. These aspects should be integrated into the Zone's purpose statement.	Amend Objective WTZ-O1 (Purpose) to have additional items referring to the Town Belt Zone as having:  - Large areas of landscape value - Areas, places, associations and structures of cultural heritage significance - Existing ecosystem values, which must be sustained and enhanced	Accept	Yes
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.91	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTZ-O1	Support	Supports WTZ-O1. Submitter considers that the green belt is a prominent aspect of Wellington city and provides a strong backdrop to the built environment and a health and wellbeing benefit to residents and visitors to the city.  Submitter considers that identifying the area as WTZ and the provisions for its protection and use promotes the continuation of its value.	Retain WTZ-O1 (Purpose) as notified.	Accept in part	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Civic Trust	388.108	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-O2	Support in part	WTBZ-O2 is partially supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective WTBZ-O2 (Managing effects) with amendment.	Accept	Yes
Wellington Civic Trust	388.109	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-O2	Amend	Considers that WTBZ-O2 is inadequate and should be amended, as it only refers to managing effects at the Zone interface and surrounding area. The Town Belt is an area which experiences significant pressure for use by non-recreational activities, for activities such as public parking, additional through-routes and the location of public services and facilities. There are also significant circumstances where the effects of access and recreational use must be managed within the zoned area itself.	Amend Objective WTBZ-O2 (Managing effects) as follows:  Adverse effects of activities and development undertaken in the Wellington Town Belt Zone are managed effectively <u>within the zone</u> and at the zone interface and surrounding area.	Accept	Yes
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.92	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-O2	Support	Supports WTBZ-O2. Submitter considers that the green belt is a prominent aspect of Wellington city and provides a strong backdrop to the built environment and a health and wellbeing benefit to residents and visitors to the city.  Submitter considers that identifying the area as WTBZ and the provisions for its protection and use promotes the continuation of its value.	Retain WTBZ-O2 (Managing effects) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Wellington Civic Trust	F583.39	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZO2	Support	Wellington Civic Trust has requested a modification to this objective – and we seek alignment with our submission.	Allow	Accept in part	No
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.93	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-O3	Support	Supports WTBZ-O3. Submitter considers that the green belt is a prominent aspect of Wellington city and provides a strong backdrop to the built environment and a health and wellbeing benefit to residents and visitors to the city.  Submitter considers that identifying the area as WTBZ and the provisions for its protection and use promotes the continuation of its value.	Retain WTBZ-O3 (Mana whenua) as notified.	Accept	No
Wellington Civic Trust	388.110	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-P2	Support in part	WTBZ-P2 is partially supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain WTBZ-P2 (Managed activities) with amendment.	Accept	No
Wellington Civic Trust	388.111	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-P2	Amend	Considers that WTBZ-P2 does not recognise the need to consider internal compatibility between activities within the Zone and should be amended.	Amend WTBZ-P2 (Managed activities) as follows:  Only allow other activities to establish in the Wellington Town Belt Zone where it can be demonstrated that they are compatible with the purpose and values of the zone, having particular regard to whether: ... 4. Any adverse residential amenity effects will be minimised. 5. <u>Adverse effects between activities are able to be avoided or limited to an appropriate level</u>	Accept	No
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.129	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-P3	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Clarify policy WTBZ-P3 (Mana Whenua)'s role to support WTBZ-O3 (Mana Whenua ). [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No
Wellington Civic Trust	388.112	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R6	Oppose in part	Considers that the construction and alteration (including extensions) of new footpaths and tracks should not be permitted activities. WTBZ-R6 should only allow for maintenance of existing such facilities, but require new such facilities to obtain consents through the default rule.	WTBZ-R6 (Construction of, and alteration and additions to footpaths and tracks) is opposed, and an amendment is sought.	Reject	No
Wellington Civic Trust	388.113	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R6	Amend	Considers that the construction and alteration (including extensions) of new footpaths and tracks should not be permitted activities. WTBZ-R6 should only allow for maintenance of existing such facilities, but require new such facilities to obtain consents through the default rule.	Amend WTBZ-R6 (Construction of, and alteration and additions to footpaths and tracks) as follows:  WTBZ-R6: <del>Maintenance of construction of, and alteration and additions to</del> footpaths and tracks  1. Activity status: Permitted	Reject	No
Craig Palmer	492.44	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R6	Oppose in part	Opposes WTBZ-R6 enabling the construction of, and alterations and additions to, carparking areas and vehicle access as a permitted status activity.  Considers that the District Plan needs to be the last bastion of the Town Belt. Recent legislation (Wellington Town Belt Act 2016, and Wellington Town Belt Management Plan June 2018) has diminished the public's awareness of the competing interests over the Town Belt. This unique public treasure has constantly required protection for the retention of free access and enjoyment since its inception in 1983. In particular, for walkers and those seeking quiet passive recreation in semi-wilderness surroundings.	Amend WTBZ-R6 (Construction of, and alteration and additions to footpaths and tracks) to be accorded discretionary activity status and for new footpaths and tracks to require mandatory public notification.	Reject	No
Wellington Civic Trust	F583.34	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R6	Support	The submissions are similar to those of the Wellington Civic Trust. We also support mandatory public notification of all consent applications in this zone.	Allow	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Craig Palmer	492.45	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R6	Amend	Opposes WTBZ-R6 enabling the construction of, and alterations and additions to, carparking areas and vehicle access as a permitted status activity.  Considers that the District Plan needs to be the last bastion of the Town Belt. Recent legislation (Wellington Town Belt Act 2016, and Wellington Town Belt Management Plan June 2018) has diminished the public's awareness of the competing interests over the Town Belt. This unique public treasure has constantly required protection for the retention of free access and enjoyment since its inception in 1983. In particular, for walkers and those seeking quiet passive recreation in semi-wilderness surroundings.	Amend WTBZ-R6 (Construction of, and alteration and additions to footpaths and tracks) to be accorded discretionary activity status and for new footpaths and tracks to require mandatory public notification.	Reject	No
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.35	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R6	Support	The submissions are similar to those of the Wellington Civic Trust. We also support mandatory public notification of all consent applications in this zone.	Allow	Reject	No
Wellington Civic Trust	388.114	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R7	Oppose in part	Considers that the construction and alteration (including extensions) of car parking areas and vehicle accesses should not be permitted activities. WTBZ-R7 should only allow for maintenance of existing such facilities, but require new such facilities to obtain consents through the default rule.	WTBZ-R7 (Construction of, and alteration and additions to car parking areas and vehicle access) is opposed, and an amendment is sought.	Reject	No
Wellington Civic Trust	388.115	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R7	Amend	Considers that the construction and alteration (including extensions) of car parking areas and vehicle accesses should not be permitted activities. WTBZ-R7 should only allow for maintenance of existing such facilities, but require new such facilities to obtain consents through the default rule.	Amend WTBZ-R7 (Construction of, and alteration and additions to car parking areas and vehicle access) as follows:  WTBZ-R7: <del>Maintenance of Construction of, and alteration and additions to</del> car parking areas and vehicle accesses  1. Activity status: Permitted	Reject	No
Craig Palmer	492.46	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R7	Oppose in part	Opposes WTBZ-R7 enabling the construction of, and alterations and additions to, carparking areas and vehicle access as a permitted status activity.  Considers that the District Plan needs to be the last bastion of the Town Belt. Recent legislation (Wellington Town Belt Act 2016, and Wellington Town Belt Management Plan June 2018) has diminished the public's awareness of the competing interests over the Town Belt. This unique public treasure has constantly required protection for the retention of free access and enjoyment since its inception in 1983. In particular, for walkers and those seeking quiet passive recreation in semi-wilderness surroundings.	Amend WTBZ-R7 (Construction of, and alteration and additions to car parking areas and vehicle access) to be accorded discretionary activity status and for new carparking areas and vehicle access points to require mandatory public notification.	Reject	No
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.36	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R7	Support	The submissions are similar to those of the Wellington Civic Trust. We also support mandatory public notification of all consent applications in this zone.	Allow	Reject	No
Craig Palmer	492.47	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R7	Amend	Opposes WTBZ-R7 enabling the construction of, and alterations and additions to, carparking areas and vehicle access as a permitted status activity.  Considers that the District Plan needs to be the last bastion of the Town Belt. Recent legislation (Wellington Town Belt Act 2016, and Wellington Town Belt Management Plan June 2018) has diminished the public's awareness of the competing interests over the Town Belt. This unique public treasure has constantly required protection for the retention of free access and enjoyment since its inception in 1983. In particular, for walkers and those seeking quiet passive recreation in semi-wilderness surroundings.	Amend WTBZ-R7 (Construction of, and alteration and additions to car parking areas and vehicle access) to be accorded discretionary activity status and for new carparking areas and vehicle access points to require mandatory public notification.	Reject	No
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.37	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R7	Support	The submissions are similar to those of the Wellington Civic Trust. We also support mandatory public notification of all consent applications in this zone.	Allow	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.313	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R9	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain WTBZ-R9 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.	Reject	No
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.314	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R9	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend WTBZ-R9 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.	Reject	No
Craig Palmer	492.48	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-R11	Amend	Considers that the District Plan needs to be the last bastion of the Town Belt. Recent legislation (Wellington Town Belt Act 2016, and Wellington Town Belt Management Plan June 2018) has diminished the public's awareness of the competing interests over the Town Belt. This unique public treasure has constantly required protection for the retention of free access and enjoyment since its inception in 1983. In particular, for walkers and those seeking quiet passive recreation in semi-wilderness surroundings.	Amend WTBZ - R11 (Construction of, and alterations and additions to buildings and structures) to require mandatory public notification.	Reject	No

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Civic Trust	388.116	Special Purpose Zones / Wellington Town Belt Zone / WTBZ-S4	Oppose	WTBZ-S4 is opposed as it sets a permitted 5% building coverage standard. It is unclear how this rule would apply in the Town Belt and deletion is suggested. Most of the "sites" within the zone are very large and the maximum gross floor area standard (30m2) would be the limiting factor. If applied to leased areas, it could result in much larger areas being leased than necessary.	Delete WTBZ-S4 (Maximum building coverage) in its entirety.	Accept	No



Original Sub Number	Further Submitter Name	Further Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
342	Friends of the Wellington Town Belt	FS.109.4	Support	Supports the MVRA submission which stresses the importance of protecting as much of the highly valued and iconic townscape of suburban housing blending into the 'soft fringes' of the Town Belt as possible. Considers that this valuable resource must be retained for the wellbeing of the citizens of Wellington.  [Refer to Further submission for full reason]	Allow	Reject	No