

Wellington City Proposed District Plan

Hearing Stream 1

Appendix B

– Recommended Responses to Submissions and Further Submissions

Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officer rec For reasons see body of report	Changes to PDP?	Further Sub No / Point No	Position	Reasons for Support or Opposition	Decisions Requested
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Peter Kelly	16.1	Support	Councillors have a democratic mandate to balance the interests of WCC residents against the important natural environment values represented by significant natural areas (SNAs). The Proposed Rules are essentially the Officer Draft Rules, but with the SNA designation removed from all residential zoned land. Requests that if SNAs are returned to residentially zoned land, the provisions in the draft District Plan are reinstated and fine-tuned.	If the Proposed District Plan is amended to allow Significant Natural Areas on residentially zoned land: Seeks that the proposed District Plan gives effect to paragraph 6 of the amendment in the name of Councillors Jenny Condie and Rebecca Matthews.	Stream 8 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Lizzie Waugh	30.1	Support	Supports higher density housing in Newtown.	Retain as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Brendon White	36.1	Support	Supports the changes in the PDP that allow more intensification for the reasons of - housing affordability - climate change - productive land use	Retain intensification provisions as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	40.1	Not specified	Restrictive district plan requirements can adversely affect the ability of aerial operators to undertake and respond (particularly to biosecurity and biosecurity threats.	Seeks that the use of airstrips and helicopter landing areas for agricultural aviation activities on an intermittent basis are adequately provided for in the Proposed District Plan.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Paul Burnaby	44.1	Amend	Considers that Council should provide heritage incentives to encourage the appropriate recognition and protection of places of historic heritage value. The following are examples to indicate the types of incentives, and is certainly not meant to be exhaustive, as there are many incentives that may be open to Council: a) Enabling Transferrable Development Rights (TDRs) for owners of historic heritage places b) Providing a 'fast-track' process for proposed development where a Conservation Plan has been prepared and provided for a historic heritage place, and where the Conservation Plan has been used to guide the proposed development.	Seeks that Council provide heritage incentives to encourage the appropriate recognition and protection of places of historic heritage value.	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Robert and Chris Gray	46.1	Amend	Considers that growth estimates are a key component to a successful plan. It is unclear what the final impact of Covid and the new working landscape will have on the city.	Seeks that the Council split the 30 year District Plan into three 10 year stages to allow for reviewed and updated population growth estimates every 10 years.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Robert and Chris Gray	46.2	Not specified	Considers that critical mass is required to preserve character and that WCC officers' recommended character precincts in Mt Victoria, guided by the Boffa Miskell Report, were reduced significantly with reasons for this decision not clear.	Seeks clarification as to why the character areas were reduced in size.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Robert and Chris Gray	46.3	Not specified	Considers that a number of empty office buildings will be suitable for converting to residential and that this could be attractive to	Seeks that the Council split the 30 year District Plan into three 10 year stages to allow for reviewed	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				students among others.	and updated population growth estimates every 10 years.						
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Grant Birkinshaw	52.2	Oppose	Considers that the District Plan Review is overly complex, and becomes less a document for the public use, and more one requiring professional (and expensive) advice to use. The District Plan Review is a discouragement of public participation in what should be a democratic instrument. The evolution of District Plans has deteriorated to this extent and requires a fresh approach.	Opposes the District Plan Review in its entirety.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Grant Birkinshaw	52.3	Amend	Considers that the District Plan review, as notified, should be reassessed to become a more user friendly public document.	Seeks that the District Plan Review process be reassessed to become a more user friendly public document.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.1	Support in part	Acknowledges the differentiation between historic heritage and character precincts, even though there is some overlap with some character precincts also being identified as heritage areas, or containing heritage buildings.	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Aro Valley Community Council	87.1	Not specified	The Aro Valley Community Council does not believe that the PDP understands or adequately responds to a number of important considerations (sunlight, aging infrastructure, character homes, wellbeing for community members particularly marginalised peoples). Considers HRZ zoning is inappropriate and some sites should retain character protection provided by the ODP. Considers that while intensification is important, it should not be at the expense of fundamentals such as biodiversity, sunlight and human scale.	Seeks site specific changes to zoning.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Aro Valley Community Council	87.2	Not specified	Considers that sunlight is scarce in Aro Valley and further losses of this will be unacceptable. Sunlight is a key component of health and wellbeing and it the Council's responsibility to protect and promote community wellbeing.	Seeks site specific changes to zoning.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Aro Valley Community Council	87.3	Not specified	Considers that any increase in population density must be accompanied by, and increase, sunny and accessible open space.	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.2	Amend	Considers that the term 'cannot be achieved' implies the standard must be complied with unless it is impossible to do so and should be changed to 'is not achieved' throughout the entirety of the Proposed District Plan. Amending the language to 'is not achieved' reflects language used in district plans elsewhere in the country and provides greater consenting flexibility for when permitted activity standards are not met.	Seeks that all instances of 'cannot be achieved' in the Proposed District Plan are changed to 'is not achieved'.	Stream 6 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B - General Point on Whole Proposed District Plan

Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oliver Sangster	112.3	Support	Supports general thrust of the plan to increase density in neighbourhood areas	Retain growth approach of intensification.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.4	Support	Supports all moves towards higher density housing. Significant housing supply increases are necessary and effective in improving housing affordability. Higher density housing is more sustainable, affordable, and resource-efficient approach, and promotes connectivity within the city.	Seeks that all moves towards higher density housing are supported. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.5	Amend	Considers that the PDP is not ambitious enough with regard to sustainability, resilience, and climate change and does not adequately recognise that we are in a climate emergency.	Seeks that the proposed District Plan should refer to the 2022 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Summary for Policymakers report, and plan and revise the District Plan, as a living document, with the specific warnings for these time frames in mind – particularly focusing on preparing for long-term consequences.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.6	Not specific	Considers that the IPCC <i>Summary for Policymakers</i> explains that in terms of adaptation and preparation for climate change, lower income population groups will suffer most from adaptation gaps. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]. Considers that WCC should take full heed of the IPCC warning and plans now in order to protect the most vulnerable communities in the future. Increasing climate resilience in Pōneke Wellington looks like addressing poverty. The needs of the private sector are often over-represented in city planning and development plans, however to improve climate resilience and social justice, vulnerable communities need to be at the front and centre of plans and city design.	Seeks that the District Plan should support the creation and maintenance of affordable, warm, dry and safe housing, infrastructure and spaces that support community-building and inclusion, improving shelter conditions, and more.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Airbnb	126.3	Support	Supports the permitted status for visitor accommodation in all zones.	Retain provisions providing for visitor accommodation as an Permitted Activity in the PDP as notified. [Inferred decision requested].	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Airbnb	126.4	Not specific	Considers that home sharers must also be good neighbours and take the issues of managing wrongdoers seriously. This is why we are eager to work with governments and communities on policies that address amenity concerns and have supported frameworks to resolve issues.	Seeks that a standardised approach is utilised to assess impacts on amenity values from visitor accommodation activities.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				[Refer to original submission for full reasons].							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.1	Support	Generally supports the aims of the PDP. In particular Precinct Properties supports the following features and objectives of the plan: (a) the creation of well-functioning urban environments (consistent with the direction set out in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS UD)); (b) the provision of sufficient development capacity to meet long term demands for housing and business land; (c) the provision of a compact urban form and urban intensification; and (d) the hierarchy of centres, and the recognition of the City Centre as the primary centre serving the wider Wellington region.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.2	Amend	Considers that it is not appropriate that the Council's discretion is restricted to all matters in the Design Guide. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications. Rather than being formally incorporated into the District Plan, the design guides should be reference documents that sit outside the District Plan. Incorporating the design guides into the district plan elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance.	Seeks that all direct references to the design guides in the Proposed District Plan provisions are deleted and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are being sought.	Stream 2 and 4 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	John Tiley	142.1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the following wording ('Protects the natural ridge top around the Upper Stebbings Valley to provide a natural backdrop to Upper Stebbings and Tawa valleys and a connected reserves network') is typical of dealing with all ridgelines.	Stream 6 point		86.24	Oppose	"Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Grant Buchan	143.4	Amend	Considers that the Spatial Plan was agreed through a robust process and it is inappropriate to re-litigate character protections/height limits.	Seeks that where character protections or height limits have been imposed over the Spatial Plan recommendations, these are removed.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Grant Buchan	143.5	Amend	Considers that where restrictions in the Spatial Plan are inconsistent with the NPS-UD and MDRS they should be removed, even if these were present in the Spatial Plan.	Seeks that height limits inconsistent with the NPS-UD (National Policy Statement on Urban Development) are removed.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Matthew Gibbons	148.2	Support	Considers there should be increased densification throughout Wellington, including in Character Precincts.	Supports the Proposed District Plan provisions that enable intensification.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amos Mann	172.6	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that easier consenting and incentives for accessible and eco-friendly developments are provided for.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amos Mann	172.7	Not specificied	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the District Plan prioritises emissions reduction, better quality of life, and community cohesion and resilience.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amos Mann	172.8	Not specificied	Supports integrating circular economy principles into the District Plan.	Seeks that waste is minimised and designed out of construction projects, and that resource recovery infrastructure is put in place to manage any remaining waste.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amos Mann	172.9	Not specificied	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.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amos Mann	172.10	Not specificied	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Tangata Whenua and Te Tiriti are placed at the core of planning.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Historic Places Wellington	182.2	Support	Supports provisions of the PDP aimed at planning for a capital city that is compact, resilient, energetic, prosperous, inclusive, connected, green, and partnered with mana whenua.	Not specified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Churton Park Community Association	189.1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the following wording ('Protects the natural ridge top around the Upper Stebbings Valley to provide a natural backdrop to Upper Stebbings and Tawa valleys and a connected reserves network') is typical of dealing with all ridgelines.	Stream 6 point		86.35	Oppose	Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 189.1].	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Chris Howard	192.7	Oppose	Opposes the Proposed District Plan for the following reasons: - Considers that it ignores that there are numerous streets in greater Wellington that contain well maintained, character, semi-heritage buildings that are predominantly single storey. -considers that the plan does not enable residential intensification that is carefully tailored to avoid destroying the widespread special character that exists across many of the city's well-established suburbs. - considers the plan risks being highly damaging to local character and the city's unique beauty and liveability. - considers the plan risks unnecessarily fragmenting neighbourhood cohesion, due to development fairness inequity - one size fits all approach to intensification	Seeks that the Council urgently undertake an updated section-by-section, and street-by-street review of all areas in their draft spatial plan to determine what level of intensification is contextually appropriate for a given section or area.	Stream 2 point		123.11	Support	Considers that upzoning heights on swathes of housing is very 'destructive'. Considers high rise sites need to be carefully and individually selected according to topology with pockets of intensity if sites allow.	Allow

				across Wellington in not appropriate across our varied property sections and suburbs. [Refer to original submission for full reason]							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.2	Oppose in part	Opposes the parts of the PDP where the northern suburbs of Crofton Downs, Ngaio and Khandallah are sacrificed for densification.	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Angus Hodgson	200.3	Support	Supports provision of more housing through increased height limits across more of Wellington City.	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington City Youth Council	201.7	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that Council actively seek and actively listen to voices of mana whenua.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington City Youth Council	201.8	Not specified	Considers the importance of Councils partnership with mana whenua throughout the decision making process. Considers that Iwi resources are often stretched by demands of crown authorities. Considers the importance of tools such as apū/Iwi Resource Management Plans	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington City Youth Council	201.9	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that Council use its resources in partnership with local iwi to provide for papakāinga housing, marae, and Māori customary and commercial activities to support the social, cultural, and economic wellbeing of tangata whenua across Te Whanganui-a-Tara.	Accept in part	No	138.16	Support	The submitter seeks that Council use its resources in partnership with local iwi to provide for papakāinga housing, marae, and Māori customary and commercial activities to support the social, cultural, and economic wellbeing of tangata whenua across Te Whanganui-a-Tara. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because Wellington City Council should partner with tangata whenua across Te Whanganui a Tara to support tino rangatiratanga.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington City Youth Council	201.10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that barriers to tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga over their ancestral lands are removed.	Accept in part	No	138.17	Support	The submitter seeks that barriers to tangata whenua exercising kaitiakitanga over their ancestral lands are removed. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because removing barriers for tangata whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga will support tino rangatiratanga.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington City Youth Council	201.11	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the plan is implemented alongside mana whenua to protect sites of spiritual and cultural significance from the impacts of climate change and pollution.	Accept in part	No	138.18	Support	The submitter seeks that the plan is implemented alongside mana whenua to protect sites of spiritual and cultural significance from the impacts of climate change and pollution. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because implementing the plan alongside mana whenua is key to partnership and also will ensure that sites of significance are protected.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington City Youth Council	201.12	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the consenting process is improved to support in-fill developments overcome logistical and delay challenges.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington City Youth Council	201.13	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that mixed use residential and commercial areas along public transport lines is encouraged to	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

					facilitate shorter trips for climate and wellbeing and better accessibility.						
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington City Youth Council	201.14	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Supports increase of density in existing urban areas.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington City Youth Council	201.15	Amend	Considers that PDP should employ environmentally friendly urban planning techniques. This including - but not limited to - Creating neighbourhoods that are more walkable, less car-centric, and have direct access to public transport lines, in addition to recreational community spaces with green amenities.	Seeks that PDP promotes environmentally friendly urban planning techniques such as creating neighbourhoods that are more walkable, less car-centric, and have direct access to public transport lines, in addition to recreational community spaces with green amenities.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington City Youth Council	201.16	Not specified	Considers that increasing housing supply, climate resilience and designing a city that meets the needs of its people, in partnership with mana whenua, is paramount.	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Avryl Bramley	202.3	Oppose	Considers that the PDP's assumption of 50,000 - 80,000 population increase by 2050 is incorrect and is more likely to be 28,000. A number of issues are raised regarding whether: - this figure been subjected to, or does the possibility exist of, bias, manipulation, control or corruption by parties who stand to benefit from the extreme intensification whilst possibly bearing few of the costs. - extreme intensification, particularly in multi story residential, would result in sale to non residents and an increase in "nobody home " buildings as seen overseas. - the figure would enable a large part of the dwellings in the city to fall under the control of the "corporate landlord" with the downstream negative effects of monopoly rents or use as de-facto hotels like Berlin. - independent arms length increases were not used as per Statistics NZ, - how this proposed level of population increase can be seen as filling any green objectives whatsoever. - how this serves and embraces TOW principles and needs, - how democratic is it for one set of Councillors in a single 3 year term to set such a high track for a horizon of 30 years and 10 future councils. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks the removal of all elements of the PDP that are relying on the assumption of 50,000 - 80,000 population growth by 2050.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Avryl Bramley	202.4	Amend	Considers that the PDP's assumption of 50,000 - 80,000 population increase by 2050 is incorrect and is more likely to be 28,000. A number of issues are raised regarding whether: - this figure been subjected to, or does the possibility exist of, bias, manipulation, control	Seeks amendment to all elements of the PDP reliant on population growth figures to base the growth on an assumption of 28,000 by 2050.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				<p>or corruption by parties who stand to benefit from the extreme intensification whilst possibly bearing few of the costs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - extreme intensification, particularly in multi story residential, would result in sale to non residents and an increase in "nobody home " buildings as seen overseas. - the figure would enable a large part of the dwellings in the city to fall under the control of the "corporate landlord" with the downstream negative effects of monopoly rents or use as de-facto hotels like Berlin. - independent arms length increases were not used as per Statistics NZ, - how this proposed level of population increase can be seen as filling any green objectives whatsoever. - how this serves and embraces TOW principles and needs, - how democratic is it for one set of Councillors in a single 3 year term to set such a high track for a horizon of 30 years and 10 future councils. <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Avryl Bramley	202.5	Amend	<p>Considers that the PDP's assumption of 50,000 - 80,000 population increase by 2050 is incorrect and is more likely to be 28,000.</p> <p>A number of issues are raised regarding whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - this figure been subjected to, or does the possibility exist of, bias, manipulation, control or corruption by parties who stand to benefit from the extreme intensification whilst possibly bearing few of the costs. - extreme intensification, particularly in multi story residential, would result in sale to non residents and an increase in "nobody home " buildings as seen overseas. - the figure would enable a large part of the dwellings in the city to fall under the control of the "corporate landlord" with the downstream negative effects of monopoly rents or use as de-facto hotels like Berlin. - independent arms length increases were not used as per Statistics NZ, - how this proposed level of population increase can be seen as filling any green objectives whatsoever. - how this serves and embraces TOW principles and needs, - how democratic is it for one set of Councillors in a single 3 year term to set such a high track for a horizon of 30 years and 10 future councils. <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that any intensification through the district plan only accounts for population increase over the lifespan of the PDP (10 - 15 years).	Reject	No	71.1	Support	<p>The District Plan is has a ~10yr planning horizon. It needs to focus on anticipated needs for this period and some 'strategic' guesswork (for infrastructure investment). Currently, the PDP appears to be overreaching regarding residential 'intensification'. Recent data from StatsNZ and other authoritative sources suggest that some planning assumptions may be seriously flawed. To the extent that some of the potential sacrifices proposed this decade are avoidable. Plus, the PDP is biased toward a laissez-faire, permissive planning approach; allowing intensification at nearly any cost (or profit), rather than a firm focus on community desires for cohesive, liveable environments, achieved by a rigorous and reliable (no surprises) planning approach, underpinned by a vision for a liveable city by design, rather than by luck.</p>	Allow

Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Avryl Bramley	202.6	Amend	Considers that Wellington has many natural hazards and that intensification beyond 1 - 2 stories is a bad idea because of this. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks the removal of any clauses or zoning that increase intensification beyond 1-2 low rise stories.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Avryl Bramley	202.7	Amend	Considers the current national legislation banning sales of residential standalone dwellings. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks the addition of provisions banning the sale of any multi level dwelling or residence to non residents owners.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Halfway House Heritage Gardeners	203.1	Amend	Considers that the application of a recession plane standard to sites adjoining scheduled heritage will to some extent avoid the adverse effects of visual dominance which can arise when new buildings are out of scale with the existing environment [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that all sites adjoining a scheduled historic heritage item or scheduled historic heritage site/building or Historic Reserve should be subject to the Height In Relation To Boundaries (HIRB) variation of 3 metres and 45 degrees.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Graham Spargo	211.1	Amend	Considers that Councillors face exposure to liability under section 43 (1) (a) of the Local Government Act due to decisions made on housing density. Considers that the evaluation process for the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 was poor and that Councillors have a responsibility to consider that. Considers that Councillors owe a duty of care to be fully informed as to foreseeable consequences of implementing '3 stories, 50% coverage' provisions in the PDP. This will lead to property market decline, and therefore exposure to liability under section 43 (1) (a). [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks the removal of "3 storey, 50% site coverage everywhere" provisions in the PDP.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Graham Spargo	211.2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks the addition of good planning practice assessments based on infrastructure availability, built form character and heritage, and walkability and other established 'good practice' ways of determining appropriate locations for intensification.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Glen Scanlon	212.2	Support	Supports solutions to create more affordable housing. Considers the continued, sustainable, growth of our city is vitally important to the well-being of residents.	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Glen Scanlon	212.3	Amend	Considers that retaining sunlight hour provisions from the operative district plan design guide will help ensure dry homes and a reasonable healthy quality of life for all. Sunlight is important to mental health	Seeks that the proposed district plan retains the provisions for sunlight hours from the operative district plan design guides.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				Auckland's design rules also support maintaining and creating living environments where sunlight is maximised [Refer to original submission for full reason]							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Glen Scanlon	212.4	Amend	Considers that construction of large buildings would require purchasing many properties in the area with major earthworks to provide suitable platforms. The costs will be high, infrastructure will be under pressure and it's a high wind zone - the PDP does not account for these. As a result, properties will be expensive and will result in renters moving out. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the plan focuses building more where building platforms are larger, flatter, have access to more parking, public services, and infrastructure such as Kent and Cambridge Terraces, Hania St and Adelaide Rd.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Robert Murray	213.2	Oppose	Opposes the entire PDP and its principles. Considers that it's too long, over-complicated, and unintelligible. It leaves decisions upon unelected officials and the technology used is for experts which still gets it wrong. [Refer to original submission for further reason]	Seeks that the entire PDP is rewritten so that it's clear and intelligible to the average person.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Robert Murray	213.3	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the PDP provides rules rather than guidelines that comply with and support Councils principles.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Robert Murray	213.4	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that Council should provide services to the public first and put customer/user first.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Robert Murray	213.5	Not specified	Considers there is no housing shortage, it is a shortage of affordable housing. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Eva Brodie	217.1	Amend	Considers that placement of even one tall building in this neighbourhood would degrade surrounding homes. A non-compliant development has become compliant under the PDP which will severely impact sunlight on the submitters home, which is counterintuitive given New Zealand's push for healthier homes. It does not make sense that a single dwelling can be allowed to have such a devastating impact on surrounding homes. Developments built to the edge of zones in the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) in Lower Kelburn will mean losses of privacy, sun, views, and access.	Seeks that the plan is amended to put more emphasis on protecting neighbours sun access.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Tyers Stream Group	221.5	Support	Considers that public access can lead to greater cognisance and care of areas by the public, and in the case of Tyers Stream Reserve result in greater restoration of natural biodiversity and	Seeks that the plan provide for public access to and within areas for which WCC has jurisdiction.	Stream 8 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				reduction of damaging events, in line with the Reserve's SNA status.							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Anna Jackson	222.1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Supports any provision that will help support actions to minimise the damage caused by climate change and help reduce emissions that are causing climate change.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Anna Jackson	222.2	Not specified	Supports more intense housing development that is linked to public transport and close to facilities such as schools, libraries and shops, to reduce reliance of private cars.	Not specified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Anna Jackson	222.3	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks addition of a 30-40% permeability standard for all sites.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Anna Jackson	222.4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks addition of a requirement for shared mini-parks and other forms of green spaces.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Anna Jackson	222.5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks addition of a requirement for consideration of waste management to be factored into planning.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Anna Jackson	222.6	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks addition of a requirement for consideration of disability access to be factored into planning.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Anna Jackson	222.7	Amend	Considers that parking and road congestion as best managed by the provision of reliable and frequent public transport, preferably free but certainly subsidised and as cheap as possible.	Seeks that mini-buses are added to serve a greater number of routes more frequently.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Nick Humphries	223.1	Amend	Considers the approach taken by Auckland City Council to provide more qualifying matters to provide greater protection of heritage/character/townscape and amenity values. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks the addition of more qualifying matters regarding heritage/character/townscape and amenity values.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	RR Ventures (2018) Ltd	227.1	Amend	Considers that the population in Northern suburbs is increasing consistently and has been earmarked for medium-density housing, we would like to understand Council's plans for further development of Glanmire Road. We are keen to work with the Council to understand the options that present an approach/ solution that is mutually beneficial for the development of this section.	Clarify intent of future development in Glanmire Road.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.1	Amend	The heritage and culture of the urban landscape contributes to everyone's overall wellbeing and quality of life	Add a new objective as follows: <u>Reflect the essential contributions made by heritage, character and quality design, giving us the ability to remember our heritage and to visually enjoy unique urban landscapes which provide character and a sense of belonging to our unique city.</u>	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B - General Point on Whole Proposed District Plan

Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Add a new objective as follows: <u>Recognise the essential value of local residents' participation in planning decisions as central to our communities' wellbeing.</u>	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.3	Amend	Considers that the detailed provisions of the PDP should be evaluated against the newly suggested objectives to ensure that the Council's chosen methods are the best options to deliver the objectives of the plan and respect the wishes of the people of Wellington..	Seeks that the PDP is evaluated against the newly suggested objectives.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.4	Amend	Considers that many sites that sit idle or under utilised business facilities. Development in these spaces will address much of future housing demand and avoid adverse effects on quality, amenity and character. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the sequence of intensification in the Proposed District Plan focus first on major areas of under utilised land and smaller groups of under utilised sites close to public transport.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan identify community-based planning for intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to the revised demolition controls.	Reject See body of report	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.6	Amend	Considers that homes should be a warm, dry places of stability, where sunlight providing natural light and mood enhancing benefits are recognized as essential to human wellbeing.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan recognise the critical importance of sunlight to the wellbeing of residents.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.7	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan ensure that current well-functioning established homes, neighbourhoods, old trees and plantings are not demolished.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.8	Support	Supports the aim of the council to provide for a greater density of population in Central Wellington.	Not specified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Richard W Keller	232.3	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks amendment to council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems and so forth that actively support the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Richard W Keller	232.4	Amend	Considers that people shouldn't need to drive to stations and use Park n Rides.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan prioritises active and sustainable travel.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Richard W Keller	232.5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan prioritises universal accessibility.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.3	Amend	Considers that the PDP needs to enable mixed use in more areas so that people can access more services by walking.	Seeks that more mixed-use development is enabled in Vogeltown, Mornington, Kingston and Brooklyn	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				Considers that the Vogeltown, Mornington, Kingston and Brooklyn suburbs lack suitable shops, supermarkets and restaurants.							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Go Media Ltd	236.1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the PDP is amended to give effect to any other elements of the submission that were not directly captured under their submission points.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Regan Dooley	239.3	Support	Supports greater density city-wide generally.	Not specified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Regan Dooley	239.4	Amend	Considers that the PDP has too many protections for heritage and character generally.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to reduce character protection to enable more intensification. [Inferred decision requested]	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Regan Dooley	239.5	Amend	Considers that the PDP has too many protections for heritage and character generally.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to reduce heritage protection to enable more intensification. [Inferred decision requested]	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Alan Fairless	242.3	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan include an objective recognising the positive value of participation in decisions on an ongoing basis, and acknowledge that this is central to communities being able to meet their needs on an ongoing basis.	Reject	no	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Alan Fairless	242.4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan include an objective reflecting the positive contributions heritage, character and quality design, and the ability to read stories in the urban landscape, make to overall wellbeing.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Alan Fairless	242.5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the detailed provisions of the District Plan be more rigorously tested against the objectives to ensure that chosen methods are the best options to deliver on the objectives of the Plan.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Alan Fairless	242.6	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the District Plan sets out a clear sequence for intensification that aligns with the sequence set out in the Spatial Plan.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Alan Fairless	242.7	Amend	Considers that given the opportunity, Wellingtonians will relish the challenge of working together which can create a sense of community, enhance democracy and deliver change in ways that build on community strengths.	Seeks that the District Plan identify communities to participate in community-based planning.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				Imposing arbitrary change when better options exist simply fosters local resentment. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Alan Fairless	242.8	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the District Plan increase the extent of new green space.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Peter Charlesworth	248.1	Support in part	Generally supports the PDP, including the rezoning from Rural Area to Large Lot Residential Zone at 11B Wilmshurst Place, Tawa.	Retain Proposed District Plan notified with amendments.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Generation Zero Inc	254.4	Support	Considers that housing is not adequate if it does not respect and take into account the expression of cultural identity. Considers that the Proposed District Plan needs to support the development of papakāinga and culturally adequate housing for Māori. Considers that under Local Governments obligations to Te Tiriti and delivering the right to a decent home, Councils must provide effective regulation to stop private enterprises from developing Māori land without free, prior and informed consent of mana whenua. [see original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan supports the development of papakāinga and culturally adequate housing for Māori. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Generation Zero Inc	254.5	Support	Considers that the Proposed District Plan needs to support the development of adequate housing through densification and supporting infrastructure for the wellbeing of everyone in the Wellington City Council area and to deliver the right to a decent home. [see original submission]	Seeks that the plan support the development of adequate housing through densification and supporting infrastructure.	Accept in part	No	89.66	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission to the extent that this aligns with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Pauletta Wilson	257.1	Support	Supports more housing in Mount Cook but wants to see it done without loss of character and diversity.	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Jim & Christine Seymour	262.3	Not specified	Supports more affordable and dense housing in central city areas but not at the risk of losing established character areas.	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Jim & Christine Seymour	262.4	Amend	Considers that mistakes have been made regarding design of buildings in the past - for example the Copthorne Hotel and Bay Plaza. Considers a design control process could prevent badly designed buildings from being built and to ensure a sustainable and enjoyable place to live.	Seeks the addition of an effective design control process for the district plan implementation.	Stream 4 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Dean Knight and Alan Wendt	265.1	Amend	Considers that when Salisbury Garden Court was listed as a heritage area, at the initiative of owners and residents, the key heritage feature sought to be protected was historic connectedness. The heritage controls imposed are, in practice, too heavy and go well beyond what is sought to be protected. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that Item 24 (Salisbury Garden Court) of SCHED3 - Heritage Areas is exempt from any other controls arising from Heritage Area status.	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington City Council	266.1	Amend	Considers there are numbering errors and minor spelling errors that need to be resolved. This includes consistent use of numbering throughout plan i.e. matters of discretion use: a, b, c or i, ii, iii (as per the National Planning Standards).	Seeks that consequential amendments are made to resolve numbering and minor spelling errors.	Wrap up point		23.84	Support	Submission point 266.1 seeks to amend numbering and minor spelling errors. FSNI submission points 476.9 & 476.10 seek to make more consequential amendments.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington City Council	266.2	Amend	Considers consequential numbering changes need to be made for all inserted or deleted provisions.	Seeks that consequential renumbering changes are made for all inserted or deleted provisions.	wrap up point		23.85	Support	Submission point 266.2 seeks to amend numbering and minor spelling errors. FSNI submission points 476.9 & 476.10 seek to make more consequential amendments.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington City Council	266.3	Amend	Considers that references to Mākara throughout the PDP are missing the macron above the 'a'.	Seeks to amend all references of 'Makara' to 'Mākara'.	wrap up point		23.86	Support	Submission point 266.3 seeks to amend numbering and minor spelling errors. FSNI submission points 476.9 & 476.10 seek to make more consequential amendments.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington City Council	266.4	Amend	Considers that references to 'dwelling' throughout the PDP should be changed to 'residential unit' as residential unit is defined, whereas dwelling is not.	Seeks to amend all references of 'dwelling' to 'residential unit'.	Stream 2 point		23.87	Support	Submission point 266.4 seeks to amend numbering and minor spelling errors. FSNI submission points 476.9 & 476.10 seek to make more consequential amendments.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington City Council	266.5	Amend	Considers there are several words that are underline (i.e. have definitions) in the PDP but the link does not work (i.e. the definition pop-up does not appear).	Amend the definition links so that the definition pop-up appears when the word is clicked for the following definitions throughout the ePlan: - Community Scale Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures - Customer Connection - Cut Height - Demolition - LAF(Max) - National Grid - National Grid Yard - Natural Hazard Mitigation Works Trenching	wrap up point		23.88	Support	Submission point 266.5 seeks to amend numbering and minor spelling errors. FSNI submission points 476.9 & 476.10 seek to make more consequential amendments.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington City Council	266.6	Amend	Considers there are several definitions where the words in the PDP do not have a link (i.e. are not underlined) to click to see the definition pop-up.	Amend PDP by adding a definition link for the following words throughout the ePlan: - Architectural Feature - Design Speed - Environment - K Value - LA90 - Marina Facilities - R Value - Radiocommunication - Reclamation - Temporary Sign Wetland	wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.2	Not specified	Considers that quarrying activities (outside the Special Purpose Quarry Zone) have a challenging role in the PDP. Despite their resource dependence and functional constraints, that they are essential to enabling the growth the city and enabling the construction of key infrastructure (such as providing material for cycleways and road, fill material for the repair and maintenance of	Not specified.	Accept in part	Yes	112.36	Oppose	Considers that Horokiwi are arguing that they are providing an essential service to the city, over a number of parts of the PDP. WCCERG agree that some materials will be necessary for new infrastructure in the city that is required in order to (as rapidly as possible) achieve a steady state circular economy where a climate-safe emphasis requires reductionism/ degrowth and using existing materials where possible.	Not specified

				three waters infrastructure), and they provide essential construction material for new dwellings, they are not recognised as 'Infrastructure' within the PDP. Concerns as to the lack of recognition (in particular policy recognition) of quarry activities within the PDP outside the Special Purpose Quarry Zone.							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.3	Amend	Considers that there is currently no plan wide recognition of the need and benefits of quarrying activities. While the General Rural zone provides one specific policy (GRUZ- P6), it relates to effects as opposed to the benefits of quarry activities and therefore is limited in its scope. While the Special Purpose Quarry Zone has a policy (and rule) framework it relates to existing quarry sites within the Special Purpose Quarry Zone only and does not have plan wide application, including for any expansion of existing quarries outside the Quarry Zone. Horokiwi suggests that the most logical place for some form of plan wide recognition of quarrying activities would be within the Infrastructure Chapter. However, it is recognised the quarries are not infrastructure as defined in the PDP. As such, as an alternative Horokiwi would support the policy recognition in other parts of the PDP (outside the Special Purpose Quarry Zone). Two policies are suggested. One relating to benefits and the other to functional constraints noting quarries are ultimately resource dependent and therefore their potential location is constrained.	Add a new policy within the PDP (outside the Special Purpose Quarry Zone) as follows: <u>The benefits of quarrying activities to the city and region are recognised and provided for.</u>	Accept in part	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.4	Amend	Considers that there is currently no plan wide recognition of the need and benefits of quarrying activities. While the General Rural zone provides one specific policy (GRUZ- P6), it relates to effects as opposed to the benefits of quarry activities and therefore is limited in its scope. While the Special Purpose Quarry Zone has a policy (and rule) framework it relates to existing quarry sites within the Special Purpose Quarry Zone only and does not have plan wide application, including for any expansion of existing quarries outside the Quarry Zone. Horokiwi suggests that the most logical place for some form of plan wide recognition of quarrying activities would be within the Infrastructure Chapter. However, it is recognised the quarries are not infrastructure as defined in the PDP. As such, as an alternative Horokiwi would support the policy recognition in other parts of the PDP (outside the Special Purpose Quarry Zone). Two policies are suggested. One relating to benefits and the other to functional constraints	Add new policy within the PDP (outside the Special Purpose Quarry Zone) as follows: <u>When assessing quarrying activities, provide for their functional needs and operational needs, and have regard to their functional constraints.</u>	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				noting quarries are ultimately resource dependent and therefore their potential location is constrained.							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.2	Not specified	Considers that the PDP needs to adequately give appropriate consideration to fire safety and operational firefighting requirements, particularly in relation to housing development and fire station development, including: - adequate access and water supply for new developments and subdivisions to ensure the submitter can efficiently and effectively respond to emergencies; and - the ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies; and the ability to undertake training for firefighters within the region.	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	McDonald's	274.1	Oppose	McDonald's is opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions and considers that developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their merits and effects. The merits of a proposal should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Remove all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed District Plan.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.2	Amend	Considers that the level of high density development in Newtown is inappropriate because of the constraint around the Three Waters. Considers that the upgrading of Wellingtons Three Water infrastructure has not kept up with demand and levels of service have reduced. Newtown in particular has high need for network upgrades and investment into Three Waters. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the level of high density development of Newtown be reduced.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Phillippa O'Connor	289.1	Support	Supports overall strategy and intention of PDP to intensify development within the City.	Not specified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.1	Support in part	Supports (in general) the Proposed District Plan as it provides for an appropriate residential and open space outcome for the land owned by the submitter - being 16 Patna Street, 109A Awarua Street and 76 Silverstream Road, Ngaio.	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		55.1	Not specified	Provide housing and open space is needed. [Inferred reference to submission 290.1]	Not specified
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.2	Oppose in part	Considers that the proposed natural environment values will place restrictions on the future use and development of the residential land within the Kilmarston block which will result in restrictive (potentially uncertain) development potential of the land for the following reasons: 1. Identification of the whole application site as	Not specified.	Stream 8 point		46.1	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	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>being within a Special Amenity Landscapes (SCHED11) (SAL); and</p> <p>2. Identification of the balance land as being within the Natural Open Space Zone without agreement being reached with the Submitter on the appropriate tenure of the land;</p> <p>Failure to provide for infrastructure within the Natural Open Space Zone (i.e. Original reservoir that was included as part of the original zoning).</p>					<p>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>		
								64.1	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
								85.12	Oppose	<p>The site at 76 Silverstream Road is within the designation of Huntleigh Park & surrounds Significant Natural Area (WC060) and zoned as a Special Amenity Landscape as noted in the submission. Huntleigh Park contains a remnant of the original forest of Te Whanganui a Tara and as such is a valuable seed source. The vegetation of Huntleigh Park and its surrounds has been reduced in size by earlier developments and its biodiversity is now in danger of becoming reduced simply by the limitation of its physical size. Any more development and vegetation clearance will place the remaining forest at greater risk of natural decline. Wellington is losing its seed source through inappropriate developments of these remnant areas and the Council has made the important decision to protect this area by recognising it as part of an Outer Green Belt Special Amenity Landscape.</p> <p>Considers that biodiversity protection and landscape overlays are appropriate for the properties in question.</p>	Disallow
								86.42	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</p>	Disallow

											and climbing up from Silverstream Road is of particularly high quality. The concept of putting housing or an access road through it would be entirely unreasonable. For all these reasons Andy Foster opposes any development in this area beyond a carefully designed reservoir. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.2]	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Tawa Community Board	294.3	Support	Supports initiatives in the plan to benefit urban intensification, both in the CBD and in Tawa.	Not specified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Tawa Community Board	294.4	Support	Supports the PDP's requirements for hydraulic neutrality.	Retain all provisions relating to Hydraulic Neutrality as notified.	Stream 5 point		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Johanna Carter	296.1	Not specified	Considers that the PDP generally aligns with the proposed RPS direction, despite being notified before this. [Refer to submission for commentary relating to the RPS]	Not specified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington Branch NZIA	301.1	Support in part	Supports the objective of the PDP to provide greater density, but not at the expense of quality control.	Not specified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.1	Support in part	Supports the PDP subject to amendments to ensure that cycling facilities are provided and enabled in a way the improves safety and accessibility.	Retain the PDP, subject to amendments that ensure cycling facilities are provided and enabled in a way the improves safety and accessibility.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.2	Support in part	Supports the PDP subject to amendments to ensure that the intensification outcomes required by the Resource Management Act 1991, as amended by the RM (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Act 2021 and the NPS-UD 2020 are enabled.	Retain the PDP, subject to amendments that ensure the intensification outcomes required by the Resource Management Act 1991, as amended by the RM (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Act 2021 and the NPS-UD 2020 are enabled.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.2	Not specified	Considers that aggregate is essential for the construction sector, for housing and transport infrastructure and for climate change adaptation.	Not specified.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.3	Not specified	Considers that it is important that the PDP does not shut off access to potential aggregate sources to provide for Wellington's current and future construction needs. As aggregate is expensive to transport, sources of this need to be close to the place of construction.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan identifies where rock for aggregate is located and protects those areas from other development and alternative land uses.	Stream 7 point		112.31	Oppose	A number of submission points made by the Aggregate & Quarry Association (please see multiple points in their submission relating to the same theme) argue that "it is important that the PDP does not shut off access to potential aggregate sources to provide for Wellington's current and future construction needs. As aggregate is expensive to transport, sources of this need to be close to the place of construction." Elsewhere, they also say: "... the District Plan must not unreasonably curtail expansion of existing quarries and establishment of new quarries..." WCCERG disagree, on the basis of primary and secondary greenhouse gas emissions from quarrying, which are no longer tenable; and the opportunity to re-use existing materials (instead of sending them to landfill, as is currently the	Disallow Seeks that instead of allowing new mining or quarrying activities and changes of use, WCC requires no expansion of any kind of mining or quarrying activities, and a second policy stating that these activities be phased out by (for example), 2030.	

Appendix B - General Point on Whole Proposed District Plan

										case).	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.4	Support in part	Considers that while the provisions in the Special Purpose Quarry Zone are appropriate as they are enabling of quarry activities, there are some potential conflicts with other parts of the PDP.	Seeks a statement that where conflicts between the Special Purpose Quarry Zone provisions and other Proposed District Plan provisions occur, the Special Purpose Quarry Zone provisions prevail.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Firstgas Limited	304.2	Not specified	The PDP needs to give effect to the RPS-Wellington Region, in particular Objective 10 and policies 7, 8 and 39.	Clarify that the Proposed District Plan gives effect to Objective 10 and policies 7, 8 and 10 of the Regional Policy Statement.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Firstgas Limited	304.3	Not specified	Considers the Proposed District Plan should: Recognise and provide for the Gas Transmission Network to be safely, effectively and efficiently operated, maintained, replaced, upgraded, removed and developed through more enabling activity statuses where effects are acceptable; - Recognise the Gas Transmission Network as having functional and operational requirements and constraints, including in respect of its location; - Recognise that on some occasions works involving the Gas Transmission Network will have adverse effects; - Ensure that adverse effects of third-party development or activities in close proximity to the Gas Transmission Network are managed to the extent that adverse effects on the network are avoided or appropriately mitigated.	Not specified.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Firstgas Limited	304.4	Not specified	Considers the Proposed District Plan should identify First Gas an affected party in the event that resource consent is required in respect of potential effects on assets owned and operated by First Gas, especially land use changes and subdivision.	Not specified.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Roland Sapsford	305.5	Amend	Considers that the District Plan should focus its action on climate change by applying targeted and focal intensification to create local nodes or "urban villages" rather than broad brush intensification or intensification focussed in already dense areas. Considers that Emission reduction through intensification occurs largely through changes in the ways and distances people travel. Intensifying already dense areas has little effect on emissions. Rather it is modest changes in focal density in lower density areas that has the most impact.	Seeks that the District Plan be amended to focus on reducing existing emissions through focal intensification and the creation of nodes or "urban villages" in areas of relatively low density, rather than simply a broad brush approach to intensification.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Roland Sapsford	305.6	Amend	Considers that light is fundamental to wellbeing and the ability of people and communities to provide for their needs, and has concerns about reduction in sunlight. Is concerned that removing the ability to address sun and shading issues on a site-specific basis will pose a risk to existing housing stock, as new	Seeks that the plan is amended to address sunlight and shading with particular reference to Aro Valley.	Stream 2 point		123.27	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.

				houses positioned to maximise solar access will shade established houses. Notes that reduction in sunlight can affect heating and lighting costs and mental wellbeing Considers that houses built 100years ago rely on sunlight access to keep them in good condition. Considers that a resource consent is a necessary means of assessing sunlight access in Aro Valley. Considers that only one six storey building in an inappropriate location in Aro valley could result in widespread shading effects] [Refer to original submission for details]							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Roland Sapsford	305.7	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the PDP be amended to recognise that character is in part derived from heritage (as set out in the Operative Plan) in pre-1930s character areas (as defined in the Operative Plan), and use a comprehensive, holistic definition of character as a qualifying matter under the National Policy Statement-Urban Development.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.1	Amend	Considers that the importance of camping should be explicitly recognised in the PDP, in line with Section 5 of the Resource Management Act 1991. In particular, camping enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being. Refer to original submission for full reasons.	Seeks that camping be recognised in the Proposed District Plan as an important activity.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association	314.2	Amend	Considers that the PDP should explicitly exempt freedom camping in all zones to ensure that this is not inadvertently caught by 'catch-all rules', for example NOSZ-R11. Considers freedom camping should instead be managed through the Council's bylaw.	Seeks an exemption for freedom camping in the Proposed District Plan on the basis that this is dealt with through the Council bylaw(s).	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Bruce Crothers	319.3	Amend	Supports G99 to G102 (external bike storage) and considers that these should be carried into the PDP rules, policies and objectives.	Seeks that the content of G99 to G102 (external bike storage) is carried into the rules, policies and objectives.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Bruce Crothers	319.4	Not specified	Supports walking for transport via tracks through green spaces via tracks through green spaces and interconnection to form a network	Not specified.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Hilary Watson	321.5	Support	Supports increasing housing and housing density as long as they are situated in places that are suitable and aligned with the Strategic Direction of the PDP.	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B - General Point on Whole Proposed District Plan

Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Hilary Watson	321.6	Support	Supports well-designed multi-unit developments as long as they are situated in places that are suitable and aligned with the Strategic Direction of the PDP.	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Richard Murcott	322.4	Not specified	Considers that Council should recognise the value of the inner city suburbs which has been achieved through the two decades of Operative District Plan, rather than jeopardising the gains in these relatively small enclaves of the city.	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Joan Fitzgerald	323.1	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that G99-102 (External bike storage) of the Residential Design Guide be referenced in the specific rules, policies and objectives.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.7	Amend	Considers that the plan leaves much of the city's environment vulnerable to demolition with no guarantee of quality and /or affordable development in its place.	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		123.38	Support	Supports submission because it is considered it is against demolition of pre-1930s homes because of the high CO2 emissions resulting and also from re-building with new materials. Council should control demolition of old buildings and seek to renovate and repurpose them to reduce CO2 emissions.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.8	Amend	Considers that investing in the infrastructure and open space improvements are great ideas. We'd like to see this activity extended to all suburbs, and not limited to Mt Cook and Newtown only.	Seeks more infrastructure and open space improvements in all suburbs.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.9	Amend	Considers that rules and guidance to ensure density is done well must be embedded into the District Plan before removal of the pre-1930s rule. The status quo around design rules is not working well, with too much discretion allowed. Council officers need unambiguous design rules to guide them around Density Done Well, but currently suffer from the lack of them – there is enormous community interest in being part of the development of design rules that will guide building in our city.	Seeks more rules on design density.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.10	Amend	Considers that community involvement is essential to bring about quality development that supports people to live well and thrive.	Seeks that the community be engaged in any and all co-design activities.	Reject	No	123.46	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.11	Support	Considers that active street frontages should be part of the district plan. Active frontages are a better use of ground floors and street front boundaries, as they allow for small business on the street to provide opportunities for community connection.	Supports active frontages in the district plan.	Stream 4 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.12	Not specified	Considers that the viewshaft from Matairangi Mt Victoria over the city towards Te Ahumairangi, Brooklyn and Mt Albert will be greatly diminished if the building heights are realised at the levels imagined in the proposed	Not specified.	Stream 3 point		49.9	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	Allow

				District Plan. There have already been a number of encroachments on the Matairangi Mt Victoria town belt to support private development.						the hill, the submitter also agrees with the MVRA submission's reference to 'soft fringes' against the Town Belt, the importance of green and open spaces, and the iconic values of the wider views of Mount Victoria. The submitter particularly supports the reference to special protection being needed for 'Mt Victoria bush and lookout - Town Belt' and 'There have already been a number of encroachments on the Matairangi - Mt Victoria town belt to support private development.'	
										Supporting MVRA's reference to special protection for Mount Victoria bus and lookout – Town Belt' and avoiding further intrusions into what is read visually as Town Belt and the critical Mount Victoria Ridgeline, the submitter requests that protection for Mount Victoria Lookout is achieved by number 22 Alexandra Road retaining the Open Space zoning and Ridgeline and Hilltops protection status as it is in the Operative District Plan. [Inferred reference to submission point 342.12]	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.13	Not specified.	Considers that the PDP should lay out a path to affordability of housing. Land values in Mt Victoria are too inflated for private developers to provide affordable and/or social housing. Commitment to partnerships from the government and Council needs to be in place before any change can happen.	Seeks that the District Plan lay out a path to affordable housing.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.14	Not specified.	Considers that the PDP encourages gentrification and the imminent moving on of more vulnerable residents from Mt Victoria. Removal of the pre-1930s rule will only speed that up, as more land under older rental properties is made available for development.	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.15	Amend	Considers that the plan should account for the impacts of population growth in schools, hospitals and hospices. It likely many schools are overcrowded, such as Clyde Quay School.	Seeks that the impacts of population growth on schools, hospitals and hospices be taken into account.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Mt Victoria Resident s' Association	342.16	Amend	Considers that the plan should account for the impacts of development surrounding schools, hospitals and hospices on access to sunlight and warmth.	Seeks that access to sunlight and warmth in schools, hospitals and hospice be protected from neighbouring tall developments.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Carolyn Stephens	344.2	Amend	Considers that the plan should identify communities which will be involved in community-based planning, based on the sequence set out in the Spatial Plan. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the plan identify communities to participate in community-based planning.	Reject	No	123.51	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Carolyn Stephens	344.3	Amend	Considers that limited notification should be prioritised in provisions (as opposed to non notification) in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between	Seeks that limited notification provisions be prioritised over non-notification, especially in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects.	Stream 2 point		123.25	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to	Allow Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.

Appendix B - General Point on Whole Proposed District Plan

				neighbours. [Refer to original submission for full reason]						be involved in their communitiy	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Carolyn Stephens	344.4	Amend	Considers that the plan should identify key potential actors and development partnerships as a method for achieving an increased rate of development on land that is underutilised. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that key potential actors and partnerships to develop underutilised land more efficiently be identified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Carolyn Stephens	344.5	Amend	Considers that the plan should identify areas suitable for intensification and provide a timetable for developing masterplans for these areas, including quality design guides and rapid assessment processes for sites within these areas.	Seeks that areas suitable for intensification be identified and that development masterplans be devised.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Carolyn Stephens	344.6	Amend	Considers that the assessment of housing capacity in Wellington needs to be based on a target of realising at least 50% of the development capacity (as measured under the Operative Plan) on underutilised land over the term of the Plan. The Plan needs to include methods to achieve this. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that methods be included to better assess housing and development capacity on underutilised land.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.67	Oppose	Considers that the Residential Design Guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages, and there is no guidance provided as to why the requirements that are applicable to non-retirement village activities apply in the same manner to retirement villages (despite retirement villages being a unique activity with substantially differing functional and operational needs)	Opposes the Residential Design Guide and seeks amendment to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Residential Design Guide.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.68	Oppose	Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide makes no specific reference to retirement villages, and there is no guidance provided as to why the requirements that are applicable to non-retirement village activities apply in the same manner to retirement villages (despite retirement villages being a unique activity with substantially differing functional and operational needs)	Opposes the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide and seeks amendment to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide.	Stream 4 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.6	Amend	Inconsistent and incorrect reference to the regional plan.	Seeks to ensure consistent reference to the regional plan throughout. By the time decisions are made on the Proposed District Plan (PDP), the regional plan will be operative so should be referred to as the 'Natural Resources Plan'.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.7	Amend	Inconsistent and incorrect reference to the Regional Policy Statement.	Seeks to ensure consistent reference to, "the Regional Policy Statement for the Wellington Region".	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington	351.8	Amend	Considers that references to the effects management hierarchy in matters of discretion should also extend to the consideration of	Seeks that where the effects management hierarchy is mentioned in matters of	Stream 8 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

	Regional Council			biodiversity compensation.	discretion, amend to include, "...and where relevant the ability to offset or <u>compensate</u> biodiversity impacts".						
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.9	Amend	Considers that the reference to the Subdivision Design Guide is currently only in two places in the Subdivision chapter. The wording 'The matters in the Subdivision Design Guide;' does not require evaluation for consistency with the design guide and could be strengthened. Greater Wellington acknowledges that the design guides use a rating system of importance for different guidelines, but do not Consider that the current wording is strong enough.	Seeks to strengthen reference to Subdivision Design Guide to require consistency with, or appropriate consideration of, its guidelines.	Stream 5 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.10	Amend	Considers that the Residential Design Guide is not referenced in any rules for the High Density Residential Zone and greenfield development areas.	Seeks to ensure that the design guides are included in all necessary rules across chapters.	Stream 2 point		126.52	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Disallow
								128.52	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Disallow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.11	Amend	Considers that the reference to the Residential Design Guide throughout residential and commercial zone matters of discretion could be strengthened. The wording used in policies, 'Fulfil the intent of the Residential Design Guide...', should be reflected in matters of discretion. The Residential Design Guide provides direction on carbon reduction, urban design, stormwater, ecology, water conservation and freshwater ecosystem health, which all contribute to achieving the PDP's strategic objectives. The Design Guide's weight as a matter of discretion should therefore reflect this. We acknowledge that the design guides use a rating system of importance for different guidelines, but do not Consider that the current wording is strong enough	Seeks to strengthen reference to Residential Design Guide to require consistency with, or appropriate consideration of, its guidelines.	Stream 2 point		126.53	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Disallow
								128.53	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Disallow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.12	Amend	Considers that the reference to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide throughout zones does not require evaluation for consistency with the design guide and could be strengthened. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide provides direction on carbon reduction, urban design, stormwater, ecology, water conservation and freshwater ecosystem health, which all contribute to achieving the PDP's strategic objectives. The Design Guide's weight as a matter of discretion should therefore reflect this. We acknowledge that the design guides	Seeks to strengthen reference to Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide to require consistency with, or appropriate consideration of, its guidelines.	Stream 4 point		126.54	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Disallow Disallow the submission point to the extent that it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
								128.54	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Disallow Disallow the submission point to the extent that it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.

				use a rating system of importance for different guidelines, but do not Consider that the current wording is strong enough.							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.13	Amend	Considers the reference to the Rural Design Guide could be strengthened in matters of discretion. We acknowledge that the design guides use a rating system of importance for different guidelines, but do not Consider that the current wording is strong enough.	Seeks to strengthen reference to Rural Design Guide to require consistency with, or appropriate consideration of, its guidelines.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.14	Amend	Considers that throughout the plan ECO-P2 is incorrectly referred to, where reference should be made instead to ECO-P1.	Seeks to amend incorrect ECO-P2 (Appropriate vegetation removal in significant natural areas) cross-references to ECO-P1 (Protection of significant natural areas).	Stream 8 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.15	Amend	Considers the earthworks, historic heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapters should recognise the potential for accidental discovery of archaeological sites and wahi tapu and require appropriate consents to include an accidental discovery protocol. This would give effect to Policy 22 of the RPS.	Seeks to amend the PDP to manage the accidental discovery of archaeological sites and wahi tapu to protect historic and cultural values.	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.16	Amend	Considers that section 3.5 of the NPS-FM 2020 requires every territorial authority to include objectives, policies, and methods in its district plan to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems and receiving environments. Further, local authorities that share jurisdiction over a catchment must co-operate in the integrated management of the effects of land use and development on freshwater. There is mention of achieving Te Mana o Te Wai in the Three Waters chapter, which we support. However, Te Mana o Te Wai is missing from other chapters, with no linkage established to other chapters an activity could have direct effects on water e.g. Infrastructure, Earthworks and Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity. Throughout the plan further provisions are necessary to support the achievement of Te Mana o Te Wai and manage potential effects of activities on water bodies. Policy FW.3 in Proposed RPS Change 1 provides some further direction for district plans that should be considered in drafting the appropriate provisions. This includes methods to manage effects on rivers, lakes, wetlands, springs and riparian margins, including any relevant water quality attribute targets in a regional plan, ecosystem values and drinking water sources. In addition, further consideration of the	Seeks to amend the district plan to give effect to Section 3.5 of the NPS-FM, specifically to provide further direction on how activities are to be managed to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies.	Accept in part	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA

				adequacy of erosion and sediment control policies for the management of sediment-laden water from sites to water bodies; rivers, estuaries and harbours, particularly Te Awarua o Porirua is required.							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.17	Amend	Considers that Policy CC.8 in Proposed RPS Change 1 seeks for activities regulated by the District Plan that relates to greenhouse gas emissions, to prioritise achieving a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions over offsetting emissions.	Seeks to identify the type and scale of activities within the PDP to which Policy CC.8 of Proposed RPS Change 1 applies.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.18	Amend	Considers that Policy CC.8 in Proposed RPS Change 1 seeks for activities regulated by the District Plan that relates to greenhouse gas emissions, to prioritise achieving a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions over offsetting emissions.	Seeks to include objectives, policies, rules and/or methods to prioritise reducing greenhouse gas emissions for the identified activities rather than applying emissions offsetting.	Reject	No	85.4	Support	Agree this proposed District Plan needs to give effect to PC1 of the RPS, to prioritise achieving a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions over offsetting emissions	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.19	Amend	Considers that proposed RPS Change 1 seeks that District Plans provide for these solutions to be part of infrastructure and development planning and design in order to manage issues such as water quality and natural hazard protection and increase resilience against climate change. A number of actions are set out in Policy CC.14 as measures that should be considered and provided for.	Seeks to amend the PDP to more broadly address nature-based solutions and their use not only to manage natural hazard risk but as part of the response to climate change and the effects of climate change. Policy direction and rules should set out a clear preference for implementing nature-based solutions in all infrastructure planning and land use development.	Reject	No	85.5	Support	District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing naturebased solutions to have regard to relevant Climate Change policies in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.20	Amend	Considers that natural nature-based solutions already exist and perform functions that support solutions to climate change. These areas are to be mapped by Greater Wellington by June 2024. District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing nature-based solutions to have regard to Policy CC.12 in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks that the PDP should include provisions for recognising the functions of the ecosystems providing nature-based solutions to climate change and avoid adverse effects on functions, including before they are mapped.	Reject	No	85.6	Support	District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing naturebased solutions to have regard to relevant Climate Change policies in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.21	Amend	Considers that natural nature-based solutions already exist and perform functions that support solutions to climate change. These areas are to be mapped by Greater Wellington by June 2024. District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing nature-based solutions to have regard to Policy CC.12 in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Seeks that policies should also direct the protection of areas that already perform a function as a nature-based solution, including the many wider benefits these can have.	Reject	No	85.7	Support	District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing naturebased solutions to have regard to relevant Climate Change policies in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.22	Amend	Considers that policy CC.4 and CC.14 of Proposed RPS Change 1 seek for actions and initiatives that contribute to climate resilient urban areas to be provided for, with a preference for the use of nature-based solutions. To have regard to these policies, the PDP should contain provisions which seek to improve the climate resilience of urban areas as part of the characteristics and qualities of well functioning urban environments.	Seeks the PDP should include provisions which seek to improve the climate resilience of urban areas through measures identified in Policy CC.14.	Reject	No	85.8	Support	District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing naturebased solutions to have regard to relevant Climate Change policies in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Allow

Appendix B - General Point on Whole Proposed District Plan

Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.23	Amend	Considers that policy CC.4 and CC.14 of Proposed RPS Change 1 seek for actions and initiatives that contribute to climate resilient urban areas to be provided for, with a preference for the use of nature-based solutions. To have regard to these policies, the PDP should contain provisions which seek to improve the climate resilience of urban areas as part of the characteristics and qualities of well functioning urban environments.	Seeks that new development areas should be required to include actions and initiatives that contribute to the broader climate resilience of the urban area through policies and rules, and the extent to which they do this should be a matter of discretion.	Reject	No	85.9	Support	District Plans should avoid adverse effects on ecosystems providing naturebased solutions to have regard to relevant Climate Change policies in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.24	Amend	Considers that both brownfield and greenfield development enabled by the PDP should ensure adequate space for public transport on roads. This includes requiring verandahs and other street frontage structures to be set back from the kerb to allow for sufficient bus accessibility	Seeks to amend transport, subdivision, zone and development area standards and rules as necessary to ensure new brownfield and greenfield development enabled by the PDP provides for sufficient bus accessibility.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.25	Amend	The submitter notes that there is no papakāinga chapter, nor are papakāinga activities specifically provided for in the zone chapters. The PDP does not provide for papakāinga on Māori owned land or ancestral land.	Seeks to include a Papakāinga chapter and provide for papakāinga on Māori owned land or ancestral land throughout the zone chapters.	Accept in part	Yes	38.24	Support	The submitter seeks the inclusion of a papakāinga chapter in the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this part of the submission because we also seek the inclusion of a papakāinga chapter in the plan, as it will provide pathways for tangata whenua to build housing and gain tino rangatiratanga in regard to housing.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Inner City Wellington	352.1	Not specified	Notes that the Proposed District Plan offers improvements in clarity and consistency over the Operative District Plan.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.3	Support in part	Considers that the comprehensive District Plan review is very important for network utility operators as land use, housing intensification and subdivision development activities proposed throughout Wellington City, as well as the Governments decarbonisation initiatives, will often instigate customer driven network utility upgrading and development. Notes that the provision of electricity infrastructure is a Part 2 matter as the provision of secure and efficient electricity is fundamental to enabling people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing. Notes that the overall content of the PDP Infrastructure provisions are well considered, robust and reflect the appropriate context for the safe and secure supply of the District's electricity distribution network.	Seeks some further refinement to the Proposed District Plan to ensure that the document is able to be effectively implemented and understood, as well as to enhance particular provisions in order to provide for the importance of electricity infrastructure.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.4	Amend	Considers that the definitions of 'Additional Infrastructure' and 'Development Infrastructure' should be given the same level of priority. For instance, Council's 'Development Infrastructure' is routinely dependant on 'Additional Infrastructure' so a balanced level of recognition and provision in the PDP is required.	Seeks that the term 'Additional Infrastructure' is appropriately applied with the same level of priority, purpose and intent as 'Development Infrastructure' throughout the PDP.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.5	Amend	It is requested that appropriate, alternative, amendments be made to the provisions to give effect to the concerns raised, in the event requested amendments are denied.	Seeks that alternative amendments be made to provisions to give effect to the concerns raised in the Wellington Electricity Lines Limited submission. [Refer to submission 355]	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Woolworths New Zealand	359.1	Amend	<p>Considers that the plan should provide a "centres plus" approach by adopting a more flexible planning regime, rather than the current PDP's direct and control model of setting commercial and land supply use. To support this "centres plus" approach, the activity status of supermarkets (essential services and catalysts for well-functioning urban environments) would be more appropriate as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Permitted in all Centre zones, - Restricted Discretionary in the Mixed-Use Zone, for larger-scale supermarkets; - Discretionary in the General Industrial Zone and General Residential Zone. <p>Currently, the PDP does not enable supermarkets in any zone without resource consent (be it for the activity itself or for the building which would be required to accommodate a supermarket in terms of GFA). This is at odds with both the higher order enabling framework set out in the PDP and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 ("NPSUD").</p> <p>It is considered that a restricted discretionary activity consent process is sufficient to undertake the assessment required to address the effects of infringements in respect of built form and site layout, without needing a broader fully discretionary approach. This again supports a more efficient consenting process to focus assessment where needed without detracting from an enabling planning framework for appropriate activities in appropriate locations. This approach is elaborated upon in additional submission points.</p> <p>The "centres plus" approach recognises the primacy of centres but also that business activity ought to be enabled in other zones, where appropriate. In particular, this approach recognises that functional need and catchment drivers may dictate the location of supermarket operations, on the fringe, or in some cases, outside of identified centres.</p>	Seeks that a "centres plus" approach is adopted in the Proposed District Plan, so as to provide more flexibility in the planning of supermarkets in Centre Zones, Mixed-Use Zones, General Industrial Zones and General Residential Zones.	Stream 4 point		23.2	Support	FSNI support supermarkets being permitted activities in Centre Zones. Submission point 359.1 supports submission points 476.92, 476.94, 476.100.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Woolworths New Zealand	359.2	Support in part	The PDP is generally supported, subject to changes which will ensure that the PDP is consistent with the stated objectives at regional and national level.	Supports the Proposed District Plan, subject to amendments.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				The general approach of the PDP is supported, in that it seeks to agglomerate small- scale retail and commercial activities within the various commercial and mixed-use zones – being the Metropolitan Centre zone, the Local Centre zone and the Neighbourhood Centre zone. The Commercial zone and the Mixed-Use zone are intended to complement the hierarchy of centres and provide for activities that are incompatible with other centres-based activities. This is reflected in Objectives CEKP-O2 and CEKP-O3, which are also generally supported.							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Woolworths New Zealand	359.3	Oppose in part	<p>Parts of the plan are not supported, as they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - lack sufficient evidential justification, particularly in respect of the PDP preceding completion of any Business Land Assessment in respect of demand, supply and forecast growth; - go beyond the stated intent of the PDP in respect of its Strategic Direction and as analysed and supported in the Council’s section 32 reports. Rather than resolving a resource management issue for the District in terms of enabling activities in the right locations, the approach taken in the PDP is a direct and control model of setting commercial land supply; - Do not give effect to the NPS-UD, which seeks well-functioning urban environments (Objective 1) through enabling urban environments to develop and change in a responsive manner (Objective 4), and requires provisions that have particular regard to providing choice (Policy 1); - Are inappropriate parts in terms of Sections 32, 74 and 75 of the RMA: Do no achieve Part 2 of the RMA. 	<p>Opposes parts of the Proposed District Plan on the grounds that they are inadequate, over-reach stated intent, do not give effect to the NPS-UD or do not appropriately respect the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission]</p>	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Woolworths New Zealand	359.4	Support in part	<p>Considers that where activities infringe identified standards, a restricted discretionary activity status remains appropriate, rather than defaulting to a more onerous discretionary activity status, where discretion is unfettered in assessment. Restricted discretionary activity status can be accompanied by suitably limited criteria that still ensure an appropriate assessment of effects is undertaken, whilst providing a level of certainty to applicants that where activities are anticipated, such assessments will be rational and streamlined. It is noted that the PDP has generally taken this approach when it comes to standard infringements with the exception of infringing MCZ-R15, NCZ-R13, and LCZ-R13 whereby discretionary activity consent is required if the provision of visible carparks along an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage is</p>	<p>Seeks that restricted discretionary activity status are retained when activities infringe identified status.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>	Stream 4 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				proposed. Woolworths considers a restricted discretionary activity status is more appropriate, and specifically with consideration given to operational and functional needs of larger commercial activities like supermarkets. Supermarkets often require car parking to be visible, both from commercial viability perspective but also given the requirements to separate loading and servicing activities from public interfaces. This site layout requires that loading is located to the rear of a store, with the building in front and the entrance accessible and legible from the car park and street frontage. Car parking to the rear removes the ability to keep loading and servicing separate from public areas and leads to safety and CPTED issues after hours. These are examples of operational and functional requirements for supermarkets that are overlooked by application of blanket urban design ideals in these standards.							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Elizabeth Nagel	368.3	Amend	Considers that the PDP should have an objective recognising the positive value of participation in decisions on an ongoing basis, and acknowledge that this is central to communities being able to meet their needs on an ongoing basis.	Seeks that an objective be added regarding the positive value of community participation in decisions.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Elizabeth Nagel	368.4	Amend	Considers that the PDP should have an objective reflecting the positive contributions heritage, character and quality design, and the ability to read stories in the urban landscape, make to overall wellbeing.	Seeks that an objective be added to recognise the positive contributions of heritage, character and quality design to overall wellbeing.	Stream 4 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Elizabeth Nagel	368.5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the detailed provisions of the District Plan be more rigorously tested against the objectives to ensure that chosen methods are the best options to deliver on the objectives of the Plan.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Elizabeth Nagel	368.6	Amend	Considers that the PDP should set out a clear sequence for intensification, as set out by the Spatial Plan. Zoning should be used appropriately to achieve this, rather than upzoning broad areas of land. The sequence should focus first on major areas of underutilised land and smaller groups of underutilised sites close to public transport. The submitter considers this is because there are many sites throughout the city which sit idle or underutilised and can be utilised for development.	Seeks that a clear sequence for intensification be devised to focus intensification on underutilised land and sites close to public transport.	Reject	No	123.7	Support	Considers that council should focus on brownfield development for affordable housing and ensuring high quality there. Considers the impact on the functioning of older neighbourhoods by random placing of high buildings must be prevented.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Elizabeth Nagel	368.7	Amend	Considers that the plan should identify communities which will be involved in community-based planning, based on the sequence set out in the Spatial Plan. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the plan identify communities to participate in community-based planning.	Reject	No	123.8	Support	Considers that council should focus on brownfield development for affordable housing and ensuring high quality there. Considers the impact on the functioning of older neighbourhoods by random placing of high buildings must be prevented.	Allow

Appendix B - General Point on Whole Proposed District Plan

Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Elizabeth Nagel	368.8	Amend	Considers that limited notification should be prioritised in provisions (as opposed to non notification) in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks greater provision for limited notification provisions over non-notification, especially in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects.	Stream 2 point		123.26	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Elizabeth Nagel	368.9	Amend	Considers that the plan should identify key potential actors and development partnerships as a method for achieving an increased rate of development on land that is underutilised. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that key potential actors and partnerships to develop underutilised land more efficiently be identified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Elizabeth Nagel	368.10	Amend	Considers that the plan should identify areas suitable for intensification and provide a timetable for developing masterplans for these areas, including quality design guides and rapid assessment processes for sites within these areas.	Seeks that areas suitable for intensification be identified and that development masterplans be devised.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Elizabeth Nagel	368.11	Amend	Considers that the assessment of housing capacity in Wellington needs to be based on a target of realising at least 50% of the development capacity (as measured under the Operative Plan) on underutilised land over the term of the Plan. The Plan needs to include methods to achieve this. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that methods be included to better assess housing and development capacity on underutilised land.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.5	Amend	Considers that the sequencing of development is aligned with increased and improved infrastructure development.	Seeks that development be provided in a sequenced manner.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Waka Kotahi	370.6	Not specified	Considers that adding a note to zones which provide for noise sensitive activities to draw applicants' attention to the reverse sensitivity provisions would be beneficial for aiding public interpretation on the planning provisions that apply. [Applicant was 'neutral' on the provisions].	Add a note in all Zone chapters that provide for noise sensitive activities: <u>Note: As well as provisions in the zone new buildings or alterations to existing buildings for noise sensitive activities are required to comply with the provisions in the NOISE chapter, which include sound insulation as a requirement in certain areas or limiting the establishment of noise sensitive activities in some cases.</u>	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.1	Support	Overall position is very supportive of the PDP and the progress towards a more liveable and sustainable City.	Not specified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.2	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line should be classified as a rapid transit service. As a permanent transit route capable of large capacity carriage of people, the Johnsonville Rail Line should be classified as a rapid transit service. GWRC's Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 recognises the route as a rapid transit route. The line also fits the definition of a rapid transit route in the NPS-UD definitions for the	Amend the Plan to add to the definitions, schedules, policies, maps, and rules provisions to designate the Johnsonville Rail Line a rapid transit route, and all stops along it, as rapid transit stops. Revise the status of the suburbs it serves, and their zones accordingly, to match the land use density expected of land along such a route, e.g. enabling	Accept	Yes	82.15	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are "planned" in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD.	Disallow

				purpose of giving effect to Policy 3(c). With the suburbs along this line well served by commercial and community facilities, and with land available that could accommodate denser development, it makes no sense for this route not to be classified in this way, and provision made for higher density development. We are facing a climate crisis and a housing crisis: this area must shoulder some of the change necessary to reduce Wellingtonian's carbon footprint, and increase housing availability and affordability along transport routes well served by community facilities, which this is.	higher buildings within the walkable catchment.					[Refer to original submission - 233]	
								114.41	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be "frequent" and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.1	Support in part	<p>points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>"1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests.</p>	Not specified.	Stream 6 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

			<p>Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p> <p>5. Strathmore Park</p> <p>We take no position on this subject, except to note that this is a legitimate “Opportunity Site” as identified in the Proposed District Plan whereas we oppose Submission 389 where it suggests Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula may be Opportunity Sites.</p> <p>6. General points in support of this further submission:</p> <p>* Shelly Bay and Watts Peninsula are very significant areas of land and hugely valued by the community.</p> <p>* That planning rules must allow the community to be fully involved in planning for their future.</p> <p>* That 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 / limit the need for community involvement, and on that basis is opposed.</p> <p>* For Shelly Bay, Taranaki Whānui’s request if granted would mean that any modification to the agreed development would be able to occur pretty much as of right up to 27 metres for the life of the District Plan and over the wider area requested in Submission 389. The proposed Shelly Bay housing development was only possible under the undemocratic Special Housing Area legislation. But we strongly oppose that being accepted as a precedent for further 27 metre buildings and a wider area of development.</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>* Much of Watts Peninsula is also covered in Ridgeline and Hilltop overlay which recognises that it is extremely widely visible from right around the harbour and from both Wellington and Hutt City. The Government's own expert landscape assessments agreed with this when Government was looking at making money from development of parts of the site.</p> <p>* The Proposed District Plan keeps Watts Peninsula as Open Space and Ridgelines and Hilltops. It also adds Significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) and a Special Amenity Landscape (because of its high level of landscape importance) Submission 389 requests that all of those restrictions be removed, and the Corrections land at least be rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned . We totally oppose this.</p> <p>The land at issue in Watts Peninsula, Mount Crawford and if the Buy Back The Bay public campaign is successful Shelly Bay can be a spectacular new park, a national heritage park, in the midst of Wellington Harbour. This is the option preferred by most Wellington people and these public preferences are consistent with the zoning for these areas in the Proposed District Plan. That is why, as above, we oppose most sections of Submission 389.</p> <p>Considers that hospitals, like residential areas, must intensify and expand; and that the NPS-UD recognises this. Southern Cross supports the PDP in part, but seeks amendments to: (a) provide for well-functioning urban environments, which give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD); (b) recognise the role of public and private hospitals as additional infrastructure; (c) enable efficient operation and expansion of hospital activities in the Special Purpose Hospital zone; (d) identify and impose appropriate controls on natural hazard risks; and (e) clarify the application of the sites and areas of significance to Māori provisions. [Refer to cover letter to submission for further details]</p>							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.2	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that hospitals, like residential areas, must intensify and expand; and that the NPS-UD recognises this.</p> <p>Southern Cross opposes the PDP in part, but seeks amendments to:</p>	Not specified.	Stream 6 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				<p>(a) provide for well-functioning urban environments, which give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD);</p> <p>(b) recognise the role of public and private hospitals as additional infrastructure;</p> <p>(c) enable efficient operation and expansion of hospital activities in the Special Purpose Hospital zone;</p> <p>(d) identify and impose appropriate controls on natural hazard risks; and</p> <p>(e) clarify the application of the sites and areas of significance to Māori provisions.</p> <p>[Refer to cover letter to submission for further details]</p>							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.3	Amend	Considers that of 'Health care facility' and 'Healthcare facility' should be used consistently within the Proposed District Plan	Seeks that either HEALTH CARE FACILITY or HEALTHCARE FACILITY is used consistently in the Proposed District Plan.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.4	Amend	Seeks for the names of other zones to be stated in full. It is unclear which zone 'HRZ' refers to.	Seeks that names of zones within the Proposed District Plan be represented by their full names, rather than acronyms.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.1	Oppose	Opposes this policy which requires some developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions in accordance with the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide. This is because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This provision elevates what is normally a design guide into a rule. A design guide should be separate to a plan. The Design Guide should be an external document to the District Plan and be referenced as a guide only. - Further, this provision, provides a mechanism for the Council to require these aspects as part of a development. This is inappropriate. A development should be assessed on its merits. 	Delete all references to City Outcomes Contributions in the Proposed Plan.	Stream 2 point		23.29	Support	Submission point 383.1 supports FSNI submission point 476.1.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Director-General of Conservation	385.1	Oppose in part	Considers that the Proposed District Plan does not adequately give effect to the NPS-FM. For example, there is a lack of objectives, policies, and methods that protect wetlands. At feedback stage for the Draft District Plan 2021, the Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) sought a new objective for wetlands to protect waterways and wetlands. The Council rejected this feedback on the basis that "wetlands jurisdiction falls within NPS-FW [NPS-FM] and Greater Wellington Regional Council jurisdiction". <p>Guidance prepared by the Ministry for the Environment2 (MfE) specifies that "territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and methods in their district plans to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems,</p>	Opposes in part to the Proposed District Plan in its current form and seeks amendment.	Stream 8 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				and receiving environments”.							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Director-General of Conservation	385.2	Amend	<p>Considers that the Proposed District Plan does not adequately give effect to the NPS-FM. For example, there is a lack of objectives, policies, and methods that protect wetlands. At feedback stage for the Draft District Plan 2021, the Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) sought a new objective for wetlands to protect waterways and wetlands. The Council rejected this feedback on the basis that “wetlands jurisdiction falls within NPS-FW [NPS-FM] and Greater Wellington Regional Council jurisdiction”.</p> <p>Guidance prepared by the Ministry for the Environment2 (MfE) specifies that “territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and methods in their district plans to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments”.</p> <p>It is noted that MfE requires the Council to notify changes to regional policy statements, regional plans, and district plans to give effect to the new NPS-FM 2020 by 31 December 2024. To avoid an additional plan change, it would be prudent for the Council to incorporate this national direction into the Proposed District Plan.</p>	Seeks that there are additional objectives, policies, and methods to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments (including wetlands).	Stream 8 point		84.11	Support	Greater Wellington strongly support requests to amend the Proposed District Plan to promote positive effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of urban development on freshwater and welcome working with WCC to give effect to the NPSFM.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Director-General of Conservation	385.3	Amend	<p>Considers that the Proposed District Plan does not adequately give effect to the NPS- FM. For example, there is a lack of objectives, policies, and methods that protect wetlands. At feedback stage for the Draft District Plan 2021, the Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) sought a new objective for wetlands to protect waterways and wetlands. The Council rejected this feedback on the basis that “wetlands jurisdiction falls within NPS-FW [NPS-FM] and Greater Wellington Regional Council jurisdiction”.</p> <p>Guidance prepared by the Ministry for the Environment2 (MfE) specifies that “territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and methods in their district plans to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments”.</p>	Seeks that the Council adopts an integrated approach with the Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) in relation to implementing the management of water and land, rather than putting the onus solely on GWRC to implement the NPS-FM.	Accept in part	Yes	84.12	Support	Greater Wellington strongly support requests to amend the Proposed District Plan to promote positive effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of urban development on freshwater and welcome working with WCC to give effect to the NPSFM.	Allow

				It is noted that MfE requires the Council to notify changes to regional policy statements, regional plans, and district plans to give effect to the new NPS-FM 2020 by 31 December 2024. To avoid an additional plan change, it would be prudent for the Council to incorporate this national direction into the Proposed District Plan.							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Director-General of Conservation	385.4	Amend	<p>Considers that the Proposed District Plan does not adequately give effect to the NPS- FM. For example, there is a lack of objectives, policies, and methods that protect wetlands. At feedback stage for the Draft District Plan 2021, the Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) sought a new objective for wetlands to protect waterways and wetlands. The Council rejected this feedback on the basis that "wetlands jurisdiction falls within NPS-FW [NPS-FM] and Greater Wellington Regional Council jurisdiction".</p> <p>Guidance prepared by the Ministry for the Environment2 (MfE) specifies that "territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and methods in their district plans to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects), of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments".</p> <p>It is noted that MfE requires the Council to notify changes to regional policy statements, regional plans, and district plans to give effect to the new NPS-FM 2020 by 31 December 2024. To avoid an additional plan change, it would be prudent for the Council to incorporate this national direction into the Proposed District Plan.</p>	Seeks that the Council work with GWRC to identify any additional sites/areas that should be protected under the Proposed District Plan and RPS in line with the NPS-FM.	Stream 8 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Director-General of Conservation	385.5	Amend	<p>Considers that the Proposed District Plan does not adequately give effect to the NPS- FM. For example, there is a lack of objectives, policies, and methods that protect wetlands. At feedback stage for the Draft District Plan 2021, the Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) sought a new objective for wetlands to protect waterways and wetlands. The Council rejected this feedback on the basis that "wetlands jurisdiction falls within NPS-FW [NPS-FM] and Greater Wellington Regional Council jurisdiction".</p> <p>Guidance prepared by the Ministry for the Environment2 (MfE) specifies that "territorial authorities must include objectives, policies, and methods in their district plans to promote positive effects, and avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects (including cumulative effects),</p>	Seeks that any policy and rules in relation to wetlands are in line with the NZCPS (New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010).	Stream 8 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				<p>of urban development on the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments”.</p> <p>It is noted that MfE requires the Council to notify changes to regional policy statements, regional plans, and district plans to give effect to the new NPS-FM 2020 by 31 December 2024. To avoid an additional plan change, it would be prudent for the Council to incorporate this national direction into the Proposed District Plan.</p>							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Director-General of Conservation	385.6	Amend	<p>Considers that it would be effective and efficient to align the review of the Proposed District Plan provisions with the policy direction and requirements anticipated under the NPS-IB, to avoid an additional plan change.</p> <p>The NPS-IB currently has no legal effect; however, it is expected to come into effect in December 2022 during the Proposed District Plan further submissions and hearing process.</p>	Seeks that the Council undertakes a review of the NPS-IB exposure draft (or the soon to be gazetted NPS-IB document) to confirm the Proposed District Plan is giving effect to this national direction.	Stream 8 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Director-General of Conservation	385.7	Amend	<p>Considers that it would be effective and efficient to align the review of the Proposed District Plan provisions with the policy direction and requirements anticipated under the NPS-IB, to avoid an additional plan change.</p> <p>The NPS-IB currently has no legal effect; however, it is expected to come into effect in December 2022 during the Proposed District Plan further submissions and hearing process.</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan should be updated to give effect to the NPS-IB where required.	Stream 8 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.7	Not specified	<p>Considers that there are also a number of properties held by Taranaki Whānui via Tai Hekenga and Crown properties that offer significant development potential, including land held by Taranaki Whānui that we have aspirations for future development and consider to be special Māori precincts. [see original submission]</p>	Seeks that Council provide a schedule of proposed zone changes for review and included a full schedule of RFR and DSP properties within Wellington City for reference.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.8	Not specified	<p>Considers that there are also a number of properties held by Taranaki Whānui via Tai Hekenga and Crown properties that offer significant development potential, including land held by Taranaki Whānui that we have aspirations for future development and consider to be special Māori precincts. [see original submission]</p>	Seeks that any decisions made in respect of landholdings over which Taranaki Whānui have an interest in, that Taranaki Whānui are consulted first so as to ensure our interests are given due consideration as required under the RMA and in line with their Memorandum of Understanding with Council.	Accept in part	No	2.13	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>	<p>Disallow</p> <p>Seeks that the part of the submission to remove the proposed zoning and overlays on Watts Peninsula be disallowed.</p>

								40.13 (This further submission will be dealt with in stream 7 and 8)	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
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.9	Amend	Considers replacing the word 'mauri' with 'mouri'.	Seeks that all references to 'mauri' be removed and replaced with 'mouri'	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.10	Oppose in part	Opposes Proposed District Plan in general as it fails to provide an adequate planning framework for Papakāinga.	Opposes the Plan in part, with amendments.	Accept in part	No	26.16	Not specified	Developing papakāinga is a complex process and there is no definition of what the papakainga might look like.	Not specified
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.11	Amend	Opposes Proposed District Plan in general as it fails to provide an adequate planning framework for Papakāinga.	Seeks that a papakāinga chapter is added.	Accept in part	No	86.3	Support	<p>Considers it is important that papakainga are allowed for. Considers that there is a problem with Taranaki Whānui's submission is that it is completely open ended about definition, location, size, design, height – and therefore potential impacts. Considers that it is quite reasonable that papakainga be allowed in areas where that level of development is anticipated. For example in residential areas allowing 11 metre heights, and the appropriate level of site coverage. That does not apply in ridgelines, special amenity areas, or open space. For Watts Peninsula this again means that a papakainga could well be a result of a master planning exercise, but it would come with some certainty about location, scale etc.</p> <p>Supports the request in part as it applies to zones where housing development of equivalent scale, height, site coverage is expected. For clarity that excludes open space and recreation zones and limits scale in rural areas.</p>	Allow

											[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.11]	
								38.35	Support	The submitter seeks for a papakāinga chapter to be added to the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this part of the submission because we also seek the inclusion of a papakāinga chapter in the plan, as it will provide pathways for tangata whenua to build housing and gain tino rangatiratanga in regard to housing.	Allow	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.4	Support in part	The PDP's approach to implement the NPSUD and the Housing Supply Act by incorporating a Centres hierarchy and intensification provisions is generally supported.	Retain the Proposed District Plan with amendments.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.5	Amend	Considers that all standards should be ensured to have an appropriate activity status and/or are referenced in the building and structure activity rules. For instance, NCZ-R18 does not require compliance with standards NCZ-S7 & NCZ-S8 which relate to residential activities.	Seeks that all standards are ensured to have an appropriate activity status and/or are referenced in the building and structure activity rules.	Stream 4 point		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.6	Support in part	The inclusion of notification preclusions for restricted discretionary activities across the plan are supported, as this creates certainty to the development market. Further amendments are sought.	Supports the preclusion of public notification for activities under Restricted Discretionary status.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.7	Amend	Considers that Public notification preclusions should be included in the PDP where impacts may apply beyond the site being developed such as side yards, height, daylight, coverage.	Seeks that the preclusion of public notification is applied beyond a development site, for breaches such as side yards, height, daylight and coverage.	Stream 2 point		107.34	Support	Stride supports these submission points for the reasons provided by the primary submitter. Stride supports precluding notification where it is unlikely to be helpful to the decision-maker (for example, where the consent breach is of a technical nature and any effects are likely to be limited to the subject site or identified surrounding sites).	Allow	
								108.34	Support	Investore supports these submission points for the reasons provided by the primary submitter. Investore supports precluding notification where it is unlikely to be helpful to the decisionmaker (for example, where the consent breach is of a technical nature and any effects are likely to be limited to the subject site or identified surrounding sites).	Allow	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.8	Amend	Considers that limited notification preclusions should apply where effects are limited to the site being developed, such as outdoor living space infringements.	Seeks that the preclusion of limited notification is applied beyond a development site, for breaches such as outdoor living space infringements.	Stream 2 point		107.35	Support	Stride supports these submission points for the reasons provided by the primary submitter. Stride supports precluding notification where it is unlikely to be helpful to the decision-maker (for example, where the consent breach is of a technical nature and any effects are likely to be limited to the subject site or identified surrounding sites).	Allow	
								108.35	Support	Investore supports these submission points for the reasons provided by the primary submitter. Investore supports precluding notification where it is unlikely to be helpful to the decisionmaker (for example, where the consent breach is of a technical nature and any effects are likely to be limited to the subject site or identified surrounding sites).	Allow	

Appendix B - General Point on Whole Proposed District Plan

Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.9	Oppose	Considers that references to 'reverse sensitivity' as part of adverse effects is unnecessary and should be removed. Reverse sensitivity can be covered by general considerations relating to adverse effects.	Remove any reference to 'reverse sensitivity' from the Plan.	Reject	No	29.4	Oppose	Specific to the National Grid, the term reverse sensitivity is used within Policy 10 of the NPSET and therefore its use within the PDP is consistent with and gives effect to the NPSET. On that basis, the relief sought by the submitter is opposed.	Disallow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.10	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Remove reference of Assisted housing throughout the PDP.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.11	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Remove reference of Comprehensive Development throughout the PDP.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.12	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Remove reference of Demolition throughout the PDP.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.13	Amend	An amendment is sought to delete any references of 'multi-unit housing' in objectives, policies, rules, and standards throughout the District Plan.	Remove reference of Multi-unit housing throughout the PDP.	Reject	No	96.1	Oppose	The amendment to remove reference to 'multi-unit housing' is opposed as special consideration is required to enable this form of housing to fit within the wider street scape and community.	Disallow
								117.1	Oppose	The amendment to remove reference to 'multi-unit housing' is opposed as special consideration is required to enable this form of housing to fit within the wider street scape and community.	Disallow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.4	Not specified	Considers that restrictions to building and land use affects Tino Rangatira and so encourages Council to consider this and adopt more flexible planning restrictions. Mana Whenua (Taranaki Whānui, Te Ātiawa) own over \$100M in property within Wellington City.	Seeks that WCC considers that restrictions to building and land use affects Tino Rangatira and adopt more flexible planning restrictions i.e. as flexible as possible.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Ministry of Education	400.2	Amend	Seeks that explicit provision is given to educational facilities throughout the urban environment to enable the submitter to manage the impacts of growth and development on educational facilities, in particular impacts on school capacity. The submitter considers that providing for educational facilities in Wellington through the strategic policy framework will support the provision of new and expansion of existing educational facilities in the Wellington region.	Seeks that educational facilities are enabled as part of urban growth and development and are considered in any zoning changes made.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oyster Management Limited	404.1	Support in part	Supports the Proposed Plan in part.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Investore Property Limited	405.1	Support	Generally supports the aims of the Proposed Plan.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Investore Property Limited	405.2	Support	Supports the creation of well-functioning urban environments (consistent with the direction set out in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD).	Not specified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Investore Property Limited	405.3	Support	Supports the provision of sufficient development capacity to meet long term demands for housing and business land.	Not specified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B - General Point on Whole Proposed District Plan

Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Investore Property Limited	405.4	Support	Supports the provision of a compact urban form and urban intensification.	Not specified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Investore Property Limited	405.5	Amend	Generally supports the intent and provisions of the design guides. However, considers that it is important that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan. Incorporating the design guides into the district plan elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide is supported and a helpful tool, however it should be a reference document that sits outside the district plan [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside of the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Stream 4 point		126.75	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
								128.75	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Investore Property Limited	405.6	Amend	Considers that it is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion is restricted to all matters in the design guides, for example under Rules CCZ-R19 and CCZ-20. This is because the design guides do not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and the submitter considers it would be onerous to potentially address two design guides in the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Seeks that all direct references to the design guides be deleted and replaced with references as appropriate and necessary to the specific design outcomes that are being sought, for example "For guidance, refer to the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide". [Inferred decision sought].	Stream 4 point		126.76	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.
								128.76	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in so far as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.2	Amend	Not opposed to the coastal inundation mapping in principle, however considers further nuancing of the provisions that relate to coastal hazards and more specifically, tsunami hazard, is required. [See paragraphs 4.85 to 4.89 of original submission for full reason]	Opposes the coastal hazard provisions that apply to coastal tsunami hazard overlays.	Stream 5 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.3	Amend	Considers that Wellington International Airport is regionally significant infrastructure. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks an amendment that appropriately recognises and provides for the Airport to operate in a safe, efficient, and effective manner, whilst ensuring that reverse sensitivity effects are avoided.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.4	Amend	Considers that Wellington International Airport is regionally significant infrastructure and is important in providing for the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people	Seeks that the PDP is amended to add functional, operational, technical and/or safety related requirements of this infrastructure.	Accept in part See recommendations for SCA-O5	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				and communities. Considers that given the lack of suitable alternative locations, providing for the ongoing operation, development and growth of Wellington Airport in its current location and safeguarding the Airport's obstacle limitation surface and aircraft noise boundaries to ensure effective and efficient airport operations is therefore of regional significance. So the functional, operational, technical and/or safety related requirements of this infrastructure require appropriate recognition in the Proposed Plan. [See original submission for full reason]							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.3	Amend	Submitter considers that there needs to be clearer decision-making processes. Submitter is concerned that the decision-making process for restricted discretionary activities could be convoluted and unnecessarily delay development. This will particularly be the case if the Design Guides are retained as they overlap with the PDP in various areas. We have suggested a 'Design Excellence Panel' be constituted for each significant development and be solely responsible for assessing design outcomes of projects. This has the potential to speed up the process, ensure appropriately qualified people are in the room together to assess applications "in the round" and achieve positive design outcomes for Wellington City. We would welcome exploring other suggestions on how to make the planning process more efficient.	Seeks that a 'Design Excellence Panel' be constituted for each significant development and be solely responsible for assessing design outcomes of projects.	Stream 4 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the importance of affordability should be acknowledged throughout the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.5	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks a thorough review of the City Outcomes Contribution process, to ensure developers receive certainty early on as to the additional height (or floor space) that will apply.	Stream 4 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.6	Amend	Generally supports the intent of the Design Guides, but opposes their inclusion in the District Plan for the following reasons: - In many areas, the Design Guides overlap with the objectives and policies in Part 3. This will cause confusion for both planners and developers in attempting to interpret the Design Guides alongside Part 3. In particular, the submitter queries how the 'Outcomes' in the Design Guides are to be read alongside other provisions in the plan.	Seeks that references to the Design Guide in the Proposed District Plan be removed and that the Design Guides should be non-statutory in a similar way to the Auckland Design Manual. They should be used for guidance on how the objectives and policies in Part 3 may be implemented.	Stream 2 point		416.6	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend
								416.6	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend

				- It will be simpler to update the Design Guides to reflect best practice if they remain non-statutory. The way the Design Guides are included as relevant criteria for restricted discretionary activities significantly expands the Council's discretion beyond what could normally be expected, for example, the Residential Design Guide contains various provisions dealing with internal areas such as G114-116 (internal living spaces) and G130-131 (internal storage).							disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Josephine Smith	419.1	Amend	Considers that many sites in the city are under utilised and that filling these gaps will provide for future housing needs without impacting quality, amenity and character.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan add a clear sequence for intensification, done through zoning. Seeks that it follows the sequence set out in the Spatial Plan and that it focus on major areas of underutilised land and smaller groups of under utilised sites close to public transport.	Reject	No	123.9	Support	Considers that council should focus on brownfield development for affordable housing and ensuring high quality there. Considers the impact on the functioning of older neighbourhoods by random placing of high buildings must be prevented.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Josephine Smith	419.2	Amend	Considers that Wellingtonians relish the challenge of working together, and that some suburbs are taking the lead in rethinking their areas. This creates a sense of community and enhances democracy. Supports participatory design projects with clear targets, so communities are involved. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to identify a sequence of communities which will be involved in community-based planning, based on the sequence set out in the Spatial Plan.	Reject	No	123.31	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow
								123.47	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Josephine Smith	419.3	Amend	Considers that Wellingtonians relish the challenge of working together, and that some suburbs are taking the lead in rethinking their areas. This creates a sense of community and enhances democracy. Supports participatory design projects with clear targets, so communities are involved. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to make greater provision for limited notification (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours.	Stream 2 point		123.32	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow
								126.112	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission and the Enabling Housing Act, and contrary to the purpose of the NPSUD.	Disallow
								128.112	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and the Enabling Housing Act, and contrary to the purpose of the NPSUD.	Disallow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.5	Amend	Considers that a framework is needed to address the significant social and economic benefits that can accrue from the operation of the regionally significant infrastructure [the airport]. The framework needs to: - Recognise the social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits of regionally significant infrastructure;	Seeks that further changes are required to the planning framework as it relates to regionally significant infrastructure, to ensure that the framework specified in paragraph 4.14 [and summarised in the reasons column] is achieved. [See paragraphs 4.14, 4.14.1,	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				<p>- Protect regionally significant infrastructure from effects of incompatible land use and development, including reverse sensitivity effects;</p> <p>- Manage the effects arising from regionally significant infrastructure, recognising that the operational and/or functional requirements of infrastructure sometimes mean that not all effects can (or should be required to) be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> <p>The PDP as notified has complex layering of consent requirements which means the above outcomes are difficult to achieve.</p>	4.14.2, and 4.14.3 in the original submission]						
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.6	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellington International Airport is regionally significant infrastructure and is important in providing for the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people and communities.</p> <p>Considers that given the lack of suitable alternative locations, providing for the ongoing operation, development and growth of Wellington Airport in its current location and safeguarding the Airport's obstacle limitation surface and aircraft noise boundaries to ensure effective and efficient airport operations is therefore of regional significance. So the functional, operational, technical and/or safety related requirements of this infrastructure require appropriate recognition in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the PDP is amended to recognise the social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits of regionally significant infrastructure.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.7	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellington International Airport is regionally significant infrastructure and is important in providing for the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people and communities.</p> <p>Considers that given the lack of suitable alternative locations, providing for the ongoing operation, development and growth of Wellington Airport in its current location and safeguarding the Airport's obstacle limitation surface and aircraft noise boundaries to ensure effective and efficient airport operations is therefore of regional significance. So the functional, operational, technical and/or safety related requirements of this infrastructure require appropriate recognition in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the PDP is amended to protect regionally significant infrastructure from effects of incompatible land use and development, including reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject	No	89.109	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the amendments which may result in constraints to urban development surrounding the airport. Furthermore, there is a lack of clarity as to the implications of the relief sought and what would constitute 'incompatible land use and development.'	Disallow

Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.8	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellington International Airport is regionally significant infrastructure and is important in providing for the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people and communities.</p> <p>Considers that given the lack of suitable alternative locations, providing for the ongoing operation, development and growth of Wellington Airport in its current location and safeguarding the Airport's obstacle limitation surface and aircraft noise boundaries to ensure effective and efficient airport operations is therefore of regional significance. So the functional, operational, technical and/or safety related requirements of this infrastructure require appropriate recognition in the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the PDP is amended to manage the effects arising from regionally significant infrastructure, recognising that the operational and/or functional requirements of infrastructure sometimes mean that not all effects can (or should be required to) be avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Reject	No					
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.9	Amend	<p>Considers that counter to the intent of the Planning Standards, the Proposed Plan contains a significant degree of repetition. This results in a duplication and layering of planning controls which is inefficient and results in additional resource consent requirements without clear direction around the effects the controls are seeking to manage.</p> <p>Given the change in technology and the change in the air industry that will be required going forward, the submitter notes that change will need to be accommodated within the Airport Zone.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that all unnecessary duplication should be removed and each chapter should focus on managing the effects that specifically relate to that chapter and are not otherwise managed by the underlying zone rules.	Stream 6 point		NA	NA	NA		NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.10	Amend	<p>Considers that the Seawall 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.</p> <p>Submitter questions the efficiency and effectiveness of the Natural Open Space zoning and the associated planning framework insofar as it relates to this area.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	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.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA		NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.11	Amend	<p>The Civil Aviation Authority of New Zealand ("CAA") produces guidance on land use activities at or near aerodromes.¹⁰ The following activities are of particular concern to Airport Operators where located within close proximity to an airport due to their potential bird</p>	Seeks that a bespoke framework should be established for refuse dumps and landfills, outdoor sewage treatment and disposal, cattle feed lots, pig farming, fish processing, artificial and natural lakes/waterbodies, and abattoirs	Stream 9 point		105.1	Support	This submission point is consistent with Airways' operations and its core functions.		Allow

				<p>attracting properties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Refuse dumps and landfills; - Sewage Treatment and Disposal (outdoor); - Certain agricultural activities (cattle feed lots, pig farming); - Fish Processing; - Artificial and natural lakes/waterbodies; and - Abattoirs and freezing works. 	<p>and freezing works where located within a fixed distance of the Airport. This framework will ensure a consenting pathway is available that requires appropriate consideration of potential increase in bird strike risk. This should include a narrowly framed restricted discretionary activity that restricts discretion to the potential effects of aircraft safety, including the potential risk of bird strike.</p>						
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.12	Not specified	<p>Considers that, without the proposed amendments specified within the submitters submission:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Proposed Plan will not promote the sustainable management or efficient use and development of natural and physical resources; - The Proposed Plan is not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, particularly when having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means; - The Proposed Plan does not appropriately fulfil the requirements of section 32 of the RMA, particularly in terms of evaluation the costs of implementing the provisions under section 32(2)(a); and - The Proposed Plan does not represent sound resource management practice particularly with respect to planning for Wellington International Airport, as regionally significant infrastructure. 	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Cheryl Robilliard	409.5	Support in part	Supports overall direction of the plan	Not specified	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	VicLabour	414.7	Amend	<p>Considers that the plan lacks a focus on affordable housing.</p> <p>Considers that while supply side interventions are important, there remains an issue of a significant proportion struggling financially because their rents have increased faster than wages for many years and house prices have climbed increasingly out of reach.</p> <p>Considers that while there are risks to overall affordability and supply from imposing a tax on new developments, the revenue raised would be redistributed to affordable housing developments, and these stronger measures would provide a strong incentive to developers to consider modest homes that are more affordable.</p>	Seeks that the Council to revisit including an affordable housing chapter in the plan.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				[See original submission for full reasons]								
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	ViLabour	414.8	Amend	<p>Considers that the plan lacks a focus on affordable housing.</p> <p>Considers that while supply side interventions are important, there remains an issue of a significant proportion of struggling financially because their rents have increased faster than wages for many years and house prices have climbed increasingly out of reach.</p> <p>Considers that while there are risks to overall affordability and supply from imposing a tax on new developments, the revenue raised would be redistributed to affordable housing developments, and these stronger measures would provide a strong incentive to developers to consider modest homes that are more affordably. [See original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the Council investigate ways to target taxes to avoid mid-range housing as part of an affordable housing scheme.	Reject	Beyond scope of the plan.	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Josephine Smith	419.4	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellingtonians relish the challenge of working together, and that some suburbs are taking the lead in rethinking their areas. This creates a sense of community and enhances democracy.</p> <p>Supports participatory design projects with clear targets, so communities are involved. [See original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to make new developments Controlled activities in respect of urban design so as to ensure that quality in design at a local level can be considered for the majority of developments, and that this process is tied to community-level design guides as they are developed.	Reject	No	126.113	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission.	Disallow	
								128.113	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Josephine Smith	419.5	Amend	<p>Considers that local government, central government, private developers and communities need to work together.</p> <p>Wellington needs innovative models for public and private land investment. [See original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to identify development partnerships as a method for achieving an increased rate of development on land that is underutilised, and that the Plan also needs to identify the key potential actors.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Josephine Smith	419.6	Amend	<p>Considers that local government, central government, private developers and communities need to work together.</p> <p>Wellington needs innovative models for public and private land investment. [See original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to identify areas suitable for intensification and provide a timetable for developing masterplans for these areas, including quality design guides and rapid assessment processes for sites within these areas.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Josephine Smith	419.7	Amend	<p>Considers that local government, central government, private developers and communities need to work together.</p> <p>Wellington needs innovative models for public and private land investment. [See original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended so that assessment of housing capacity in Wellington needs to be based on a target of realising at least 50% of the development capacity (as measured under the Operative District Plan) on underutilised land over the term of the Proposed District Plan, and needs to include methods to	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	

					achieve this.						
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Josephine Smith	419.8	Amend	Considers that Wellingtons livability, character and heritage can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan identify community-based planning for intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to revised demolition controls.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.1	Amend	Considers that the Proposed District Plan should be amended to prioritise Newtown as a Pilot programme and to identify a sequence of communities which will be involved in a community-based planning, based on the sequence set out in the spatial plan. See original submission has concept designs and 3D models of the proposed community- based planning idea.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to prioritise Newtown as a Pilot programme and to identify a sequence of communities which will be involved in a community-based planning, based on the sequence set out in the spatial plan.	Reject	No	69.27	Support	TRA seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to prioritise Newtown as a Pilot programme and to identify a sequence of communities which will be involved in a community-based planning, based on the sequence set out in the spatial plan.	Allow
								111.48	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to be amended to make greater provision for limited notification (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to light so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours.	Stream 2 point		89.161	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 420.2 in part to the extent that it is inconsistent with the Kāinga Ora submission.	Disallow
								111.49	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
								123.28	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.3	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to be amended to make greater provision for limited notification (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to shading so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours.	Stream 2 point		111.50	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
								123.29	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	The Urban Activation Lab	420.4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to be amended to make greater provision for	Stream 2 point		111.51	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional	Allow

	of Red Design Architects				limited notification (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to privacy so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours.					housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	
								123.30	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight, shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	Allow Seeks that council instate notification procedures as requested.
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to be amended to make greater provision for limited notification (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to wind effects so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours.	Stream 2 point		111.52	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.6	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect of urban design so as to ensure that quality in design at a local level can be considered for the majority of developments, and that this process is tied to community-level design guides as they are developed.	Reject	No	111.53	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.7	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to identify the Newtown Suburban Centre area suitable for intensification and provide a timetable for developing the community-led masterplan for this area, including quality design guides and rapid assessment processes.	Reject	No	111.54	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.8	Not specified	Supports the Newtown Residents Association submission.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		111.55	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.9	Not specified	Supports the submission of LIVE Wellington.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		111.56	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow

Appendix B - General Point on Whole Proposed District Plan

Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	New Zealand Defence Force	423.5	Amend	Considers that NZDF facilities are in many district plans throughout the country (including the Proposed Selwyn District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan Operative in Part).	Seeks that any existing and future defence facilities in Wellington City are recognised and provided for in the Proposed District Plan.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.7	Amend	Considers that local government, central government agencies, private developers, and communities need to work in partnership not as adversaries. Considers that Wellington needs innovative models for public and private investment working together to rapidly develop Wellington's large areas of underutilised land into high quality housing, greenspace and small business facilities. Current proposals assume a meagre 14% of rezoned areas will be developed. LIVE WELLington wants to see partnerships that can realise the potential of at least half our underutilised land in the next ten years.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan identifies development partnerships as a method for achieving an increased rate of development on land that is underutilised, and that the Plan also needs to identify the key potential actors.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.8	Amend	Considers that local government, central government agencies, private developers, and communities need to work in partnership not as adversaries. Considers that Wellington needs innovative models for public and private investment working together to rapidly develop Wellington's large areas of underutilised land into high quality housing, greenspace and small business facilities. Current proposals assume a meagre 14% of rezoned areas will be developed. LIVE WELLington wants to see partnerships that can realise the potential of at least half our underutilised land in the next ten years.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to identify areas suitable for intensification and provide a timetable for developing masterplans for these areas, including quality design guides and rapid assessment processes for sites within these areas.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.9	Amend	Considers that Wellington's liveability, character and heritage can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan identify community-based planning for intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to revised demolition controls.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.10	Amend	Considers that Wellington's liveability, and its character and heritage, can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. Not every old building needs to be retained, but neither are people's sense of connection and place disposable commodities. Rather than wholesale deregulation and the widespread removal of protections, heritage and character can be considered as part of community dialogue, while new construction focuses first on under-utilised land.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to identify community-based planning for intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to the revised demolition controls set out above.	Reject	No	123.44	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow

Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Fabric Property Limited	425.2	Support	Supports the aims of the Proposed District Plan. In particular submitter supports the following features and objectives of the plan: (a) the creation of well-functioning urban environments (consistent with the direction set out in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPSUD)); (b) the provision of sufficient development capacity to meet long term demands for housing and business land; (c) the provision of a compact urban form and urban intensification; and (d) the hierarchy of centres, and the recognition of the City Centre as the primary centre serving the wider Wellington region.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Paul M Blaschke	435.2	Amend	considers that Design Guides could have little effect on development in the City due to the fact much of the intensification building that will take place will not be subject to resource consents under the RMA. The use of the relevant PDP and other guidelines should be promoted as best practice and where possible incentivised through relevant policy provisions in the PDP. Such provisions may help enable the design objectives sought in the PDP and the guidelines, through market forces. It is finally noted that MfE guidelines on the Resource Management Enabling Act also refers to Design Guide guidelines, stating "See the non-statutory national medium density design guide which encourages high-quality and well-functioning design for residential developments that are permitted under the MDRS. This is for voluntary use alongside any design guidance territorial authorities use to assess development that requires resource consent."	Seeks that relevant sections of the PDP be amended to promote the use of the Subdivision and other Guidelines as best practice.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Michelle Rush	436.1	Amend	Considers that there should be more local provision for recycling and reuse including collection and sorting facilities, in line with Council's signalling of moves to a circular economy. Currently, such activities fall within the definition of heavy industry, and aren't easily provided for at local level. Local recycling facilities should be enabled at neighbourhood or local centre scale as part of supporting a circular economy.	Seeks that the plan provisionally enable the collection and processing of recycled waste at smaller scale, in more places, as a controlled activity.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Dale Mary McTavish	448.3	Oppose	Opposes the Proposed District Plan in its current form.	Seeks that Draft District Plan be reinstated. [Inferred decision requested]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	John Wilson	453.1	Amend	Considers that the extent of the zones should be clearly defined, e.g. by lines on a map. If defined by distance from the centre point, this should be defined in terms of distance from the centre point. Not in terms of time eg say	Seeks to clarify how zones are defined in terms of distance from the centre point compared to time in minutes walked.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				five or ten minutes walk from the centre of the zone as this requires a subjective interpretation of how far and how fast a typical pedestrian could walk.	[Inferred decision requested]						
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Marilyn Head	457.6	Oppose	Does not support housing intensification. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that intensification is not enabled [inferred decision requested].	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.3	Not specific	Considers that there should be mandatory design requirements. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add mandatory design requirements. [inferred decision requested].	Stream 4 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.3	Oppose	Opposes upzoning entire suburbs and catchments, leaving developers to pick favoured individual sites.	Seeks that specific areas, where the community as a whole will benefit from development, should be upzoned rather than upzoning entire suburbs and catchments. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No	123.12	Support	Considers that upzoning heights on swathes of housing is very 'destructive'. Considers high rise sites need to be carefully and individually selected according to topology with pockets of intensity if sites allow.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.4	Amend	Considers that underutilised and smaller groups of underutilised sites close to public transport should be targeted for development. These are prime sites for apartments close to the city and require less infrastructure spend and coordination than many other sites.	Seeks that underutilised and smaller groups of underutilised sites close to public transport are targeted for development, including the strips along Adelaide Road, Kent Terrace, and Thorndon Quay.	Reject	No	123.10	Support	Considers that council should focus on brownfield development for affordable housing and ensuring high quality there. Considers the impact on the functioning of older neighbourhoods by random placing of high buildings must be prevented.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that land identified as priority for development through community planning processes should be prioritised for intensification, also supported by infrastructure and transport investments.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.6	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that community-based planning as a method for intensification is adopted and describe a process for this in the District Plan.	Reject See body of report	No	123.45	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.7	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that a target of at least 50% of the development capacity being realised on underutilised land over the term of the Plan is added.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.8	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that policies and methods are incorporated in the District Plan to support faster, high quality development for these sites (i.e. underutilised and smaller groups of underutilised sites close to public transport, and land identified as priority for development through community planning processes).	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B - General Point on Whole Proposed District Plan

Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.9	Amend	Considers that the NPS-UD is divorced from actual need because it requires councils to deliver a great deal of new development capacity all at once above the amount required at the time. This includes raising height limits irrespective of need. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Council adopt a strategy of staging the release of new capacity for development, at least in the inner city suburbs, and prioritising areas for redevelopment.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.10	Amend	Considers that the NPS-UD is divorced from actual need because it requires councils to deliver a great deal of new development capacity all at once above the amount required at the time. This includes raising height limits irrespective of need. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that Priority Development Areas for residential development are specified in the District Plan.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Stride Investment Management Limited	470.1	Support in part	Generally supportive of the aims of the proposed plan. The following features and objectives are supported: - the creation of well functioning urban environments. - the provision of sufficient development capacity. - the provision of a compact urban form and urban intensification. - the provision of a range of commercial and mixed-use environments. - the hierarchy of centres. - recognition of Johnsonville as a Metropolitan Centre. the provision for six storey residential development in the wider Johnsonville catchment.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Stride Investment Management Limited	470.2	Amend	Opposes to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development. Considers it inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Remove all references to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' from the PDP and Design Guides.	Stream 4 point		123.15	Support	Considers that adding extra building height in the Inner City for social contribution should not be allowed under any circumstances.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Foodstuffs North Island	476.1	Oppose	Opposes NCZ-P10, LCZ-P10, MCZ-P10, and CCZ-P11 and related rules. While FSNI recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a	Remove all references in the PDP and Design Guides to City Outcomes Contributions.	Stream 4 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				specified and required list. The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the PDP strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing for development capacity and urban intensification.							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Foodstuffs North Island	476.66	Amend	Generally supports the intent and provisions of the Design Guide, it is important that the design guides are reference documents that sit outside the PDP, rather than being formally incorporated into it. Incorporating the design guides into the PDP elevates these provisions into the form of standards, rather than what they are intended to be as guidance. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion is restricted to all matters in the Design Guide. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants and is onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Seeks the relevant provisions (which refer to design guides as notified) instead refer to the specific design outcomes that are being sought.	Stream 4 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Ben Barrett	479.6	Not specified	Submitter wishes to second James Coyle's DP submission.	Supports James Coyle's submission. [Refer to submission 307]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Ben Barrett	479.7	Not specified	Seeks to see more inclusion of the lessons learnt form urban planning around the globe.	Seeks to see more inclusion of the lessons learnt form urban planning around the globe within the plan.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Ben Barrett	479.8	Not specified	Considers that there is very little detail in the DP to prevent poor quality outcomes that meet minimum criteria in planning and consenting phase. Considers that Wellington is at a crucial juncture between needing to rapidly modernise and build more densely, but being in danger of developing over all that makes Wellington a vibrant city, a cultural centre, and a great place to live. What we do has to be of higher quality. To minimise emissions over the longterm we also need to significantly improve the quality of urban planning and building performance.	Seeks that there is greater detail in the DP to prevent poor quality outcomes that meet minimum criteria in planning and consenting phase. [Inferred decision requested]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Ben Barrett	479.9	Not specified	Submitter considers that Wellington needs to become denser, and this can happen with carefully considered urban form that relates to the existing surrounding structures, culture and community. Submitter considers that the District Plan does not do this and needs to better encourage the quality of urban form to be highest possible. For example, if we do not consider embodied energy of urban form and building stock, we will	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan should better encourage the quality of urban form with density. [Inferred decision requested]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				not achieve our cities low emissions goals. To meet Climate goals and resource conservation goals, all new urban form needs to be build to last 100 year plus. If we're planning to build for 15 or 20 years, this will not meet the needs of future generations, it will burden them with much higher re-development cost and unnecessarily force more emissions into the atmosphere.							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Ben Barrett	479.10	Oppose	Considers that Newtown is unfairly targeted for the highest of intensification. All of Wellington should be subject share the same intensity goals.	Opposes the level of intensification in Newtown. [Inferred decision requested]	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Ben Barrett	479.11	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the District Plan will ensure building heights are tiered and not haphazard.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Ben Barrett	479.12	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the District Plan will support low embodied emission and high performance building experimentation by reducing red tape and cost.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Ben Barrett	479.13	Amend	Seeks that the highest intensity needs to happen in concentrated pockets, not allowed to be placed haphazardly across anywhere in Newtown. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that highest intensity developments needs to happen in concentrated pockets. [Inferred decision requested]	Stream 2 point		123.13	Support	Considers that upzoning heights on swathes of housing is very 'destructive'. Considers high rise sites need to be carefully and individually selected according to topology with pockets of intensity if sites allow.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Ben Barrett	479.14	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the District Plan will include: a) protections for existing property owners to prevent overshadowing from new multi-story buildings, or b) current market rate compensation options for existing property owners that are overshadowing from new multi-story buildings.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Ben Barrett	479.15	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the District Plan will encourage the protection of Newtown's pockets of heritage character, and will pay particular attention to building height and structure in these areas.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Ben Barrett	479.16	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the District Plan promotes safe cycle pathways fully separate from traffic.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Ben Barrett	479.17	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the District Plan promotes better use of land and urban space by allowing boundary sharing (of walls or partitions on the boundary) if both parties are in agreement.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B - General Point on Whole Proposed District Plan

Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Ben Barrett	479.18	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the District Plan needs to support the removal of private cars and on street car parking, and to make way for active travel, safe cycle paths away from traffic and public transport.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Ben Barrett	479.19	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the District Plan needs to: a) support safe attractive walking corridors; with food growing that is cared for by Council staff.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Catharine Underwood	481.3	Not specified	Considers that the PDP does not provide consistent natural and physical features and characteristics that contribute to a unique 'sense of place. Allowing large 22m buildings next to pepper potted heritage and character will create small, disconnected blocks easily compromised or destroyed by high density development adjacent.	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.1	Amend	Considers that there should also be provision for requiring that significant developments that do not in themselves contribute to pedestrian amenity make a financial contribution towards that	Add a new provision requiring that significant developments that do not in themselves contribute to pedestrian amenity make a financial contribution towards that.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.20	Not specified	Considers that too many buildings have blank walls, high and solid fences or frontages dominated by spaces such as carparks. This makes these spaces less safe for walkers.	Seeks that buildings are designed so as not to have blank walls and high and solid fences or frontages dominated by spaces such as carparks. [inferred decision requested].	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.21	Amend	Supports the inclusion of a section on "assisted housing" and the inclusion in that of a financial contribution provision. Considers it is important that the city continues to have a mix of residents in all areas.	Amend the plan to include an "Assisted Housing" chapter.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	House Movers Section of the New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	485.1	Amend	Considers that the regulatory controls in the District Plan need to properly reflect the purpose and intentions of the RMA 1991 as expressed in the decision of the Environment Court in New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc v The Central Otago District Council (Environment Court, C45/2004, Thompson EJ presiding). In that decision the Environment Court held that there was no real difference in effect and amenity value terms between the in situ construction of a new dwelling and relocation of a second-hand dwelling, subject to appropriate permitted activity performance standards.	Seeks that the regulatory controls in the District Plan properly reflect the purpose and intentions of the RMA 1991 as expressed in the decision of the Environment Court in New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc v The Central Otago District Council (Environment Court, C45/2004, Thompson EJ presiding).	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	House Movers Section of the New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	485.2	Support	Supports (in general) the change to enable the relocation of buildings as a permitted activity status for those applications involving relocated buildings that meet performance standards and criteria, as set out in the submission's	Retain approach of the plan that relocated buildings are not treated differently to those constructed on site.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				attachment Schedule 1. [Refer to original submission for Schedule 1 attachment].							
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	House Movers Section of the New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	485.3	Support	Supports the WCC retaining a degree of control over relocated buildings through the use of performance/permitted activity standards.	Retain approach of the plan that relocated buildings are not treated differently to those constructed on site.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	House Movers Section of the New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc	485.4	Support	Supports Restricted Discretionary activity status for relocated buildings that do not meet the Permitted Activity status standards.	Retain approach of the plan that relocated buildings are not treated differently to those constructed on site.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.4	Amend	Considers that there is no obvious linkage throughout the plan to Te Mana o Te Wai and is concerned that there are no other references in other chapters.	Seeks that the plan is amended to include more references to Te Mana o Te Wai.	Accept in part	No	84.109	Support	Greater Wellington strongly support direction to give effect to Te Mana o te Wai and provide for a more integrated approach by weaving freshwater direction throughout the Proposed District Plan.	Allow
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.5	Amend	Considers that the Papakāinga Design Guide needs to refer to an associated chapter.	Seeks that a Papakāinga chapter be included in the plan.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.6	Amend	Concerned that the plan does not provide for Papakāinga	Seeks that the plan provides for Papakāinga on Māori owned land or ancestral land. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.7	Amend	Concerned that the plan does not provide for Papakāinga	Seeks that the plan provides for Papakāinga in zone chapters. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Jonathan Markwick	490.1	Support	Supports the preference for a compact city where growth is concentrated within the existing urban area of Wellington, in particular the city centre, town centres, inner suburbs and along public transport corridors.	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Jonathan Markwick	490.2	Oppose	Opposes any rules that make the vision of a compact city where growth is concentrated within the existing urban area of Wellington, in particular the city centre, town centres, inner suburbs and along public transport corridors difficult to achieve. Considers it distressing that council is restricting or effectively banning new housing where demand for new housing is highest during a housing crisis.	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	John McSoriley and Pierre David	493.1	Not specified	Considers that there are areas of Wellington that are much more suitable for intense urban development (than Lower Kelburn).	Seeks that urban development is focussed in areas including Te Aro especially around the state highway 1 (known as the bypass): the flat area to the west of Cambridge Terrace: the area	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

					between the Basin Reserve and the Wellington Regional Hospital, and perhaps also central parts of the suburb of Kilbirnie, around or over the Wellington railway station marshalling yards and the adjacent area of Thorndon Quay and the Wellington port (especially if the port is moved further north) and also the flat parts of the area very near the city known as Kaiwharawhara. [Inferred decision requested].						
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand	496.1	Support	The Proposed District Plan is supported in its entirety. The PDP does a good job of establishing the enabling approach needed to allow for the Hospital to respond to changing health needs. the proposed objectives, policies, and rules, are supported, including where thresholds are set for planning involvement.	Retain the Proposed District Plan as notified.	Stream 6 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand	496.1	Support	The Proposed District Plan is supported in its entirety. The PDP does a good job of establishing the enabling approach needed to allow for the Hospital to respond to changing health needs. the proposed objectives, policies, and rules, are supported, including where thresholds are set for planning involvement.	Retain the Proposed District Plan as notified.	Stream 6 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers' rec Reasons – see body of report	Changes to PDP?	Further Submission No / Point No	Position	Reasons for Support or Opposition	Decisions Requested
Other / Other / Other	Kay Larsen	447.1	Not specified	Considers that summary of submission on Draft District Plan was insufficient.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Mark Jones	13.1	Amend	Considers that the Council shouldn't assume Wellington residents want population growth and engages with residents about this.	Not Specified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Simon Cocks	20.1	Not specified	Downtown Wellington is unsafe. Poneke Promise is insufficient. [refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council improve public safety in Wellington.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Simon Cocks	20.2	Not specified	Wellington Water lacks competency and accountability. [refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks better governance and accountability for Wellington Water.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Simon Cocks	20.3	Not specified	Social housing is not a core competency of council. Private organisations administer this role better [refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council exits its role as a social housing provider.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Simon Cocks	20.4	Not specified	WCC is unable to successfully manage basic infrastructure assets. [refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council supports the Three Waters proposal.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Simon Cocks	20.5	Not specified	Buses in Northland don't come frequently enough. [refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council improve Northland suburb public transport by increasing frequency.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Simon Cocks	20.6	Not specified	Risk of bike theft in the city reduces incentive to use cycleways. [refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council take measures to reduce bike theft in the city.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Mark Tanner	24.1	Support	Supports the beautification of Wellington with LGWM and the new parks.	Not specified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Abby and Amos Leota	27.1	Not specified	Considers that the current demographics (Census, 2018) for the Northern Linden, Tawa area (from Coates street walkway back to Wall Park) have not been considered. [refer to original submission for full reason].	Not specified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Sharon Grealley	29.1	Not specified	[No reasons given other than decision]	Supports Mount Victoria Historical Society's submission. [refer to submission 214]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Peter Preston	42.1	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Grant Birkinshaw	52.1	Not specified	Considers that the submission form for public consultation does not provide the detail of what is written when printed out.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	James Barber	56.1	Amend	Property developers will benefit most from densification and should contribute. Civic spaces are much needed with densification.	Seeks that a levy is introduced on property developers to contribute to civic spaces with densification.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Phil Kelliher	58.1	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B - General Point - Other

Other / Other / Other	Phil Kelliher	58.2	Not specified	The lack of adequate infrastructure needs to be regarded as a qualifying matter precluding high density development in Mount Victoria and other inner city suburbs.	Seeks that development potential is not increased in Mount Victoria as there is inadequate infrastructure.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Juliet Cooke	68.1	Support	Considers that their position is supported by the Boffa Miskell Report and that as Moir Street will be Heritage Area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites.	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Tracey Paterson	74.1	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report with respect to the interface between Moir Street and the CCZ.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Tracey Paterson	74.2	Support in part	Supports density done well and the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ, but does not support density at all costs.	[Not specified]	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Tim Bright	75.1	Not specified	Submission is made in conjunction with the Wellington Historical Society Documents	[Not specified]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Judith Graykowski	80.1	Not specified	Considers that there are benefits in retaining carbon by keeping old wooden houses rather than producing emissions from the activities needed for new builds.	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Ann Mallinson	81.1	Not specified	Considers that the assumption that Wellington will have 80,000 extra residents in the coming years is based on research done before the Covid epidemic. It is now generally agreed that these figures no longer apply.	Not Specified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Amanda Wang	93.1	Not specified	Concerned about rates. Refer to original submission for further detail]	[Not specified]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Susan Birch	94.1	Not specified	Concerned about rates. Refer to original submission for further detail]	[Not specified]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	John Liu	95.1	Not specified	Concerned about rates. Refer to original submission for further detail]	[Not specified]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Interprofessional Trust	96.1	Not specified	Considers that owners wanting to use neighbour's land for daylighting purposes should be able to do so by private treaty.	[Not specified]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Tim Brown	97.1	Not specified	Considers that Mayor Foster and CEO should resign for the stale state of the city.	Seeks that Mayor Foster and CEO resign.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.1	Not specified	Victoria University is a significant property owner in Wellington and has a planned programme of works to revitalise university buildings over the next 10 years, called the Campus Development Plan (CDP). Considers that the controlled activity status in the Operative District Plan that has applied to such works has ensured good design outcomes for major campus projects to date. The CDP proposes to connect the Kelburn campus with 320 and 320A The Terrace, and to conserve and repurpose the McLean Flats. There is no ability, appetite or available resource to repurpose the Gordon Wilson Flats.	Not specified.	Stream 6 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				Considers that, due to the state of disrepair, any heritage values associated with the Gordon Wilson Flats are now significantly undermined.							
Other / Other / Other	Tawa Business Group	107.1	Support	Supports the proposed intensification of the Tawa town centre and surrounding residential areas, facilitated by the increased building height and density within the proposed Medium Density Residential/High Density Residential and Neighbourhood Centre/Local Centre zones.	Seeks that the Tawa town centre and surrounding residential areas are intensified. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Oliver Sangster	112.1	Not specified	Considers that Johnsonville Mall and the surrounding carparks is highly inefficient and that it has huge development potential as flat sunny land right next to the Johnsonville railway, numerous open space parks and Waitohi library.	Seeks that the Council consult with Kainga Ora and the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development over the use of powers under the Urban Development Act 2020 to acquire the Johnsonville Mall site in the event that development of the site does not occur.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Oliver Sangster	112.2	Amend	Considers that the road is steep and vehicles frequently speed. Has witnessed a number of vehicle crashes taking place on this road. Considers that an increase in vehicle traffic from the Upper Stebbings/Glenside West Development area is likely to increase crashes creating more hazards for road users and pedestrians.	Seeks that the Council consider methods to reduce traffic speed down Westchester Drive between Melksham Drive and Middleton Rd roundabout.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Candy Cheung	115.1	Oppose	Submission in opposition - no details supplied.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Summerset Group Holdings Limited	118.1	Not specified	Supports the submission of the philVillages Association of New Zealand in its entirety.	Supports the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand submission in its entirety.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.1	Not specified	Considers that the protection of heritage buildings, character housing, private space, skylines, and aesthetics should not compromise the more important functions of the city. Student's sense of place in Pōneke Wellington is determined by our ability to live here well, and what we're able to do here. The vibrancy, accessibility and functionality of the city are some of its most important aspects for students.	Seeks that the City's "identity" is promoted through prioritising affordability, accessibility, well-being, functionality, arts, nature, and public space.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.2	Not specified	Supports actions taken by the PDP to support the WCC's Te Atakura - First to Zero policy.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.3	Not specified	Considers that climate resilience should require a holistic approach.	Seeks that housing and city areas should have a people-centred design.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Airbnb	126.1	Not specified	Considers that local districts and councils should take the opportunity to support efforts to streamline and simplify Residential Visitor	Seeks that local districts and councils take the opportunity to support efforts to streamline and	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				Accommodation regulation at the central government level. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	simplify Residential Visitor Accommodation regulation at the central government level.						
Other / Other / Other	Airbnb	126.2	Not specified	Considers that consistency for guests and hosts is important and that a national approach is the most effective way to address these concerns. The NSW Code of Conduct is an example of a standardised approach with a robust compliance and enforcement mechanism. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that a similar mechanism to the NSW Code of Conduct is employed as part of a national framework.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.1	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support and do not don't undermine the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.2	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the District Plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Anne Lian	132.1	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the District Plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Anne Lian	132.2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Ingo Schommer	133.1	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Ingo Schommer	133.2	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the District Plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Ingo Schommer	133.3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA

					mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested].						
Other / Other / Other	Olivier Reuland	134.1	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Olivier Reuland	134.2	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the District Plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Olivier Reuland	134.3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Grant Buchan	143.1	Not specified	Considers that one of the biggest drivers of carbon emissions in relation to transport has been increases in private car use and this reliance on cars has much to do with Wellington's detached housing development of land at the city fringes. This low density has generally made it uneconomic for business providing necessary goods and services, such as groceries, within walking and cycling distance. Similarly any amenities in these areas such as schools, recreation facilities etc are largely only accessible to sufficient numbers of people to justify the expense of their construction and upkeep if they are serviced by car. This car infrastructure tends to crowd out cycling and walking as ways to access local amenities in these areas.	Not specified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Grant Buchan	143.2	Support	Supports the Generation Zero submission in its entirety.	Not specified. (Submission 254 Generation Zero Inc.)	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Grant Buchan	143.3	Support	Supports the A City For People submission in its entirety.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Braydon White	146.1	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Braydon White	146.2	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the PDP.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Braydon White	146.3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA

					mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested].						
Other / Other / Other	Matthew Gibbons	148.1	Not specified	Considers that the submissions process favours established Wellington residents who have time to wade through a long District plan, and who don't personally experience most of the disadvantages of not allowing densification.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Vivienne Morrell	155.1	Support	Supports the Boffa Miskell 2019 report on character areas.	Supports the Boffa Miskell 2019 report on character areas.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Vivienne Morrell	155.2	Not specified	Considers that there are benefits in retaining carbon by keeping old wooden houses rather than producing emissions from the activities needed for new builds.	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Dr Briar E R Gordon and Dr Lyndsay G M Gordon	156.1	Support	Supports the Hon Sir Douglas White submission in its entirety.	Supports the Hon Sir Douglas White submission in its entirety. [Refer to submission 287]	Wrap up point		69.66	Support	These submissions align with the Association's submissions for the Hobson precinct, the Portland/Hawkestone precinct, and the Selwyn precinct.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	James and Karen Fairhall	160.1	Support	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its comments on boundary setbacks: 'it is common for a side, rear or front boundary set back to provide space between buildings. Set-backs can be used to provide a degree of privacy separation between adjoining buildings, allow site access/circulation or to address scale/dominance of buildings in relation to one another. Set backs in the order of 1-3m are common'.	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Sophie Kahn	161.1	Not specified	Considers that commissioners must be capable of considering and assessing the Jewish perspective.	Seeks that a commissioner capable of understanding a Jewish perspective be appointed to the hearings panel for the Proposed District Plan.	Wrap up point		16.10	Support	The Jewish perspective is very relevant to the historical contexts of the building the Khan House. It is well-documented in several sources but is not perse illuminated in the house's architecture. It is also a very sensitive 'context', and the Kahn family and Jewish community should have the sole right to determine how they wish to manage the home's heritage and future.	Allow Seeks that Kahn House to be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.
								91.25	Support	The further submitter is supportive of the submission and believe the same right should apply to all cultures and the Jewish community should choose how their heritage is protected. {See original further submission for full reason}.	Allow Seeks that the Council engage with cultural groups with respect to their heritage, and the protection of it, rather than deciding for them or dictating to them how it will be protected.
Other / Other / Other	Karen and Jeremy Young	162.1	Support	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its comments on boundary setbacks: 'it is common for a side, rear or front boundary set back to provide space between buildings. Set-backs can be used to provide a degree of privacy separation between adjoining buildings, allow site access/circulation or to address scale/dominance	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				of buildings in relation to one another. Set backs in the order of 1-3m are common'.							
Other / Other / Other	Jill Ford	163.1	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that developers have the opportunity to have reduced development fees if there is low cost accommodation included.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Trelissick Park Group	168.1	Not specified	Considers that with housing intensification and more extreme weather events due to climate change, the problems caused by stormwater in Trelissick Park are becoming worse. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Amos Mann	172.1	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that lifts in multi-storey developments are incentivised.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Amos Mann	172.2	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Council works with central government to improve accessibility and building performance requirements in the Building Code.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Amos Mann	172.3	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that WCC work with Waka Kotahi to make a more liveability-focused and climate-focused road and street network, especially where intensification is happening.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Amos Mann	172.4	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Amos Mann	172.5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested].	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Patrick Wilkes	173.1	Support	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Patrick Wilkes	173.2	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Patrick Wilkes	173.3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested].	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Patrick Wilkes	173.4	Support	Considers this important so that people don't need to drive to stations, nor traverse inhospitable park-and-rides once they get there.	Seeks that universal accessibility, and active and sustainable travel be prioritised for access to public transport.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B - General Point - Other

Other / Other / Other	Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.1	Support	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its comments on boundary setbacks: 'it is common for a side, rear or front boundary set back to provide space between buildings. Set-backs can be used to provide a degree of privacy separation between adjoining buildings, allow site access/circulation or to address scale/dominance of buildings in relation to one another. Set backs in the order of 1-3m are common'.	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Pete Gent	179.1	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Pete Gent	179.2	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Pete Gent	179.3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested].	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	James Harris	180.1	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	James Harris	180.2	Not specified	Considers that state highways operated by Waka Kotahi should respond to city council needs so that (for example) they support cycleways and other traffic intersections with local roads.	Seeks that state highways operated by Waka Kotahi should respond to city council needs.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	James Harris	180.3	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	James Harris	180.4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested].	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Historic Places Wellington	182.1	Support	Supports submission from Wellington Heritage Professionals. [refer to submission 412]	Supports the Wellington Heritage Professionals submission on the PDP. [Refer to submission 412]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B -General Point - Other

Other / Other / Other	Ros Bignell	186.1	Support	Supports the site by site character analysis proposal by the Boffa Miskell character report 2019.	Supports the Boffa Miskell character report 2019.	Stream 2 point		68.19	Support	Supports submission seeking that character protections should extend to Lawrence Street, Newtown.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Ros Bignell	186.2	Not specified	Supports the Newtown Character Protection Group submission in its entirety.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		68.20	Support	Supports submission seeking that character protections should extend to Lawrence Street, Newtown.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.1	Support	Supports the Boffa Miskell Report 2019.	Supports the Boffa Miskell Report 2019.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.2	Support	Supports the Mount Victoria Historical Society Submission.	Supports the Mount Victoria Historical Society Submission. [Refer to submission 214]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Chris Howard	192.1	Oppose	Opposes changes to the RMA, considering it a blanket approach to densification and over simplistic. Considers that densification for Wellington needs to be highly tailored to the city's existing and considerable widespread special character.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Chris Howard	192.2	Not specified	Concerned by the level of polarisation that is evident in the housing debate.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Chris Howard	192.3	Not specified	Considers that decision making needs to be take a balanced view, considering the nuanced benefits of how much-needed housing intensification can be achieved.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Chris Howard	192.4	Not specified	Considers that stronger leadership is exerted by those Chairing the WCC debate on the PDP to ensure that the process is impartially driven more by technical merit rather than by polarised agendas	Seeks that debate on the Proposed District Plan is impartial and driven by technical merit.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Chris Howard	192.5	Not specified	Considers that the PDP should not be rushed to ensure the best long-term outcomes, extending this process may be needed, including, another public iteration of the spatial plan, that includes greater transparency as to how public feedback is being actioned.	That further public consultation is undertaken on the plan and it is not rushed to meet RMA implementation timeframes. [Inferred decision requested]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Chris Howard	192.6	Amend	Supported the Draft Spatial Plan and considered that detailed consideration had gone into its development, through a local process that appreciated the Wellington specific trade-offs.	Seeks that the Spatial Plan is updated to ensure compliance with the RMA, with qualifying matters regarding Wellington's widespread special character further analysed and documented instead of the Proposed District Plan as notified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Mary-Anne O'Rourke	195.1	Not specified	Considers that there is a valid risk in the future from ratepayers, who are unable to attain house insurances for council consented houses that have been built in known flood and tsunami prone areas, taking future class actions against the Council.	Not specified.	Stream 5 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Mary-Anne O'Rourke	195.2	Not specified	Considers that transport infrastructure investment in the Eastern Suburbs is much needed.	Not specified.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Peter Nunns	196.1	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				amenities.							
Other / Other / Other	Peter Nunns	196.2	Not specified	Considers that the WCC needs to tackle the issue of water/wastewater/stormwater capacity and upgrades, especially as new housing development may cause some further pressures.	Seeks that appropriate resources are allocated to identifying water/wastewater/stormwater infrastructure capacity and upgrade costs.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Peter Nunns	196.3	Not specified	Considers that there is a need to ensure adequate in-house staffing to process resource and building consents quickly and at an affordable cost.	Seeks that appropriate resources are allocated to ensure resource consent and building consent processing is done as efficiently and transparently as possible, including good internal or external reviews.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Andrew Flanagan	198.9	Support	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Andrew Flanagan	198.10	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Andrew Flanagan	198.11	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested].	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.1	Support	Supports the original Draft Spatial Plan, prior to the Government relaxing planning rules for developers, which had a much more holistic and well-considered approach to densification across the entire city, and appeared to give consideration all potential affected parties i.e. building higher in urban centres, and gradually tapering off building height as distance from urban/suburb centre increases.	Supports the Draft Spatial Plan, with regard to its densification approach.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Angus Hodgson	200.1	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Angus Hodgson	200.2	Support	Supports the submission put forward by Mt Cook Mobilised.	Supports the submission put forward by Mt Cook Mobilised.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Wellington City Youth Council	201.1	Not specified	Considers the role of tangata whenua of Aotearoa as kaitiaki over the land. Considers that Land use by Crown institutions such as Council has often been in conflict with the holistic nature of the Māori world view and has not allowed tangata whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga over their ancestral lands and to carry out customary activities.	Seeks that Council repairing injustices and work to ensure that the institutional barriers restricting tangata whenua from exercising their rights are removed and repaid.	Accept in part	No	131.35	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to	Allow

										live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	
								138.15	Support	The submitter seeks that Council repairing injustices and work to ensure that the institutional barriers restricting tangata whenua from exercising their rights are removed and repaid. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because removing institutional barriers and repairing injustices will create better partnership between Council and tangata whenua. This wil also support tino rangatiratanga.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Wellington City Youth Council	201.2	Support	Considers that well-functioning three-waters infrastructure has often evaded Wellington. Considers that the renewal and replacement of aging infrastructure with a growing population and the impacts of climate change considered is essential. Supports investment into three waters infrastructure for te mana o te wai and the health and wellbeing of Wellingtonians.	Seeks that investment is made to three waters infrastructure.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Wellington City Youth Council	201.3	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks reduction in cost and disruption through coordination of different sub-street-level utility replacement or renovation projects.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Wellington City Youth Council	201.4	Support	Considers that council can facilitate City Centre accessibility by considering accessibility when making decisions around parking and drop off zones which can be part of ensuring CBD access to people with disabilities.	Seeks that council consider disability accessibility when making decisions around parking and drop off zones.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Wellington City Youth Council	201.5	Support	Considers that non-car parking such as for E-Bike and e-scooter 'Locky Docks' should be incorporated into city design, incentivizing the use of alternative and green modes of transport.	Seeks that non-car parking be incorporated into city design.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Wellington City Youth Council	201.6	Not specified	Submitter emphasises the role of maintaining high efficiency, high volume and accessible public transport in the process of increasing urban space density.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Avryl Bramley	202.1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the number of residents living in the city centre is capped and reduces over time.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Avryl Bramley	202.2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks a whole of city and a suburb by suburb earthquake and Tsunami risk assessment around existing and proposed buildings to ensure that sufficient resources	Stream 5 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

					are likely to be available in the event of a major earthquake.						
Other / Other / Other	Kim McGuiness, Andrew Cameron, Simon Bachler, Deb Hendry, Penny Evans, Stephen Evens, David Wilcox, Mary Vaughan Roberts, Siva Naguleswaran, Mohammed Talim, Ben Sutherland, Atul Patel, Lewis Roney Yip, Sarah Collier Jaggard	204.1	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Stream 2 point		68.6	Support	Not specified.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Kim McGuiness, Andrew Cameron, Simon Bachler, Deb Hendry, Penny Evans, Stephen Evens, David Wilcox, Mary Vaughan Roberts, Siva Naguleswaran, Mohammed Talim, Ben Sutherland, Atul Patel, Lewis Roney Yip, Sarah Collier Jaggard	204.2	Support	Supports the submission put forward by [Inferred] Newtown Residents Association	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Dougal and Libby List	207.1	Support	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its comments on boundary setbacks: 'it is common for a side, rear or front boundary set back to provide space between buildings. Set-backs can be used to provide a degree of privacy separation between adjoining buildings, allow site access/circulation or to address scale/dominance of buildings in relation to one another. Set backs in the order of 1-3m are common'.	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Craig Forrester	210.1	Support	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its comments on boundary setbacks: 'it is common for a side, rear or front boundary set back to provide space between buildings. Set-backs can be used to provide a degree of privacy separation between adjoining buildings, allow site access/circulation or to address scale/dominance of buildings in relation to one another. Set backs	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				in the order of 1-3m are common'.							
Other / Other / Other	Glen Scanlon	212.1	Oppose	Considers that It is highly unlikely that the country will return to previous immigration levels in the near future and that contributions to growth from mount Victoria is small.	Seeks that the plan I made more flexible rather than having one-size-fits-all approach.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
					[Inferred decision requested]						
Other / Other / Other	Robert Murray	213.1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that cycle lanes should be able to be used by motorcycles.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Sam Stocker & Patricia Lee	216.1	Amend	Considers that far too much historic character areas have been left out of the Newtown and Berhampore areas which will destroy quality of life for their community. The land is not needed to help cope with Wellingtons increasing population. Land values will soar and will lead to unpayable rates bills and loss of sunlight access. New builds more than three storeys high are expensive and won't provide low-cost housing. Average residents will either be forced away or live in ghetto conditions. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council proactively work to make empty and unused land become housing or mixed commercial land rather than land banked.	Accept in part	No	68.46	Support	Supports submission that seeks character precinct extensions in Newtown.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Sam Stocker & Patricia Lee	216.2	Support	Considers that we live in a society that relies on cars and taking away street parking will make the historic area unliveable. The simple answer to making our neighbourhood more cycle and walking friendly is to lower the speed limit across the city. Considers that the neighbourhood needs to retain its carparks. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that residents parking in historic areas is protected.	Stream 9 point		68.47	Support	Supports submission that seeks character precinct extensions in Newtown.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Jill Wilson	218.1	Amend	Considers that the inner city lacks greenspace. 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. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Green Network Plan become a statutory component of the Proposed District Plan.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Jill Wilson	218.2	Amend	Considers that green spaces in the City Centre should be designed for families and the people living in the area rather than lunchtime workers.	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]	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Tyers Stream Group	221.1	Oppose	Considers that the existing three waters infrastructure has suffered from lack of maintenance and renewals, and shows signs of significant failure, causing ongoing and significant contamination (water and air), erosion events and other problems in Tyers Stream. Opposes further development and intensification	Land use intensification and all development (e.g., residential growth) to only occur if there is a fully functional and resilient Three Waters Infrastructure in place prior to development.	Stream 5 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				until significant upgrading of three waters capacity can be ensured and is put in place.							
Other / Other / Other	Tyers Stream Group	221.2	Oppose	Considers that the existing three waters infrastructure has suffered from lack of maintenance and renewals, and shows signs of significant failure, causing ongoing and significant contamination (water and air), erosion events and other problems in Tyers Stream. Opposes further development and intensification until significant upgrading of three waters capacity can be ensured and is put in place.	Seeks no urban intensification in the Tyers Stream catchment until the Three Waters Infrastructure has the capacity, the upgrades, the resilience, and appropriate monitoring and maintenance to manage the growth, without causing damage to, and contamination of the stream, the catchment's biodiversity, and its airshed.	Stream 5 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Tyers Stream Group	221.3	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks appropriate monitoring and maintenance of infrastructure to ensure retention of capacity, necessary upgrades, resilience, and avoidance of adverse environmental effects.	Stream 5 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Tyers Stream Group	221.4	Amend	TSG has been in contact with other community bodies which have explained how they can assist in development and provision of walking access, but only where this can be identified and connected through Council action. At present, the Tyers Stream Reserve is not adequately connected to residential Khandallah.	Seeks that public access to, along and within Tyers Stream Reserve be developed by WCC in line with its policies on public access.	Stream 8 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Richard W Keller	232.1	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Opposes the construction of a second vehicle tunnel.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Richard W Keller	232.2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that "Lets Get Wellington Moving" is renamed to "Lets get Wellington Serious About Climate Change".	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.1	Amend	Considers that the maximum height in the residential area of Khandallah should be 11m	Amend the height in the mapping to 11m in Khandallah.	Stream 2 point		131.3	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Wellington's Character	233.2	Amend	Considers that the maximum height in Khandallah Village should be 14m	Amend the height in the mapping to 14m in Khandallah Village.	Stream 4 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

	Charitable Trust											
Other / Other / Other	Regan Dooley	239.1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Council binds land use and transport closer together to they create co-benefits and don't undermine each other.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Regan Dooley	239.2	Amend	Supports better resourcing for Council Officers related to the submission points.	Seeks better resourcing for Council officers.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Alan Fairless	242.1	Support	Supports the submission for LIVE Wellington.	Supports the submission of LIVE Wellington. [See Submission 155 - LIVE Wellington].	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Alan Fairless	242.2	Not specified	Considers that innovative models for public and private investment working together are needed to rapidly develop Wellington's large areas of underutilised land into high quality housing, greenspace, and small business facilities. Current proposals only develop 14% of rezoned areas. LIVE Wellington want to see partnerships that will develop at least 50% of underutilised land in the next ten years.	Seeks that the District Plan identify key potential actors and development partnerships to achieve an increased rate of development on underutilised land.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Richard Norman	247.1	Not specified	Considers that greater housing density should not be at the expense of existing wooden housing, which is proven to be earthquake resistant.	Seeks that Council maps areas of the central city which are underdeveloped, with a focus on Te Aro and major roads through Newtown to identify where higher apartments could be built without destroying or shading wooden heritage.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Richard Norman	247.2	Not specified	Requests that the commissioners are mindful that the greenest buildings are those that are already built, and that using wood is less carbon intensive than using steel or concrete. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that wholesale rezoning is replaced with research and evidence-based analysis of city precincts and neighbourhoods, and the upzoning in the Proposed District Plan is given a more considered investigation and consideration of alternatives for creating affordable housing.	Accept in part	No	123.37	Support	Supports submission because it is considered it is against demolition of pre-1930s homes because of the high CO2 emissions resulting and also from re-building with new materials. Council should control demolition of old buildings and seek to renovate and repurpose them to reduce CO2 emissions.	Allow	
Other / Other / Other	Richard Norman	247.3	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that WCC review it's capital rating system and its contribution to underdevelopment of the city, and investigate how rated based on unimproved land values could make more development land available.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Richard Norman	247.4	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that WCC review whether it needs a specialist development agency.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Richard Norman	247.5	Not specified	Considers that the highest level of the terrace has buildings which provide a rare reminder of 19th century Wellington. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that WCC include advice from Heritage New Zealand with regards to large buildings at the highest levels of The Terrace.	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Richard Norman	247.6	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that WCC map in detail the impacts of proposed rezoning on	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

					the most affected localities and neighbourhoods about how housing can be increased without blighting large blocks of pre 1930s houses.						
Other / Other / Other	Friends of the Bolton St Cemetery Inc	250.1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that any statement made by the Council in respect of the Cemetery's history is fully and properly researched by qualified people and that such research is done in consultation with the Friends of the Bolton St Cemetery.	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Friends of the Bolton St Cemetery Inc	250.2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Friends of the Bolton St Cemetery are party to any change of status that might later be proposed to the listing in the Proposed District Plan.	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Cherie Jacobson	251.1	Amend	Supports the Wellington Heritage Professionals group submission.	Seeks that the table of specific submission points on the Proposed District Plan in the Wellington Heritage Professionals group submission are submitted.	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Friends of Khandallah	252.1	Amend	Considers that large scale residential will lead to erosion of commercial by residential. Theoretical planning from other cities is not necessarily good for Khandallah. Commercial areas need to be protected in Khandallah for resilience and emergencies. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the height limits in the Khandallah local centre zone in the operative district plan are amended from 12m to 8m.	Stream 4 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Generation Zero Inc	254.1	Amend	Considers that the Proposed District Plan needs to create space for different housing typologies, such as papakāinga, to be developed with ease. The rules and regulations of the PDP must be relevant, applicable, and adaptable, to different types of housing. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Generation Zero Inc	254.2	Not specified	Considers that more analysis that complies with section 77L is required. Considers that applying Character Precincts within the Medium Density Residential Zone WCC has not provided a section 32 analysis that complies with section 77L of the RMA. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that more information is provided with respect to the Character Precincts is undertaken that complies with the requirements of section 77K and 77L of the Resource Management Act 1991. [inferred decision requested]	Stream 2 point		89.65	Support	Kāinga Ora supports further assessment is required if Character Precincts/Overlays are to remain in the District Plan.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Generation Zero Inc	254.3	Not specified	Considers that at the time of preparing this submission, the impact assessment had not yet been made publicly available. The section 32 report notes that at the time of publishing, the requisite detailed assessment has not yet been undertaken and will be published in approximately August 2022. Submitter was unable to comment on the adequacy of the impact assessment.	Seeks the ability to make a further submission point on the assessment on the impacts of limiting development capacity through qualifying matters, when the assessment is available. [inferred decision requested]	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				[see original submission]							
Other / Other / Other	Jim & Christine Seymour	262.1	Not specified	Considers that current infrastructure cannot cope with significant increases in load. Considers how well the current power network will cope with intensification. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that infrastructure - potable and sewer networks in particular - are upgraded before denser housing is implemented.	Stream 5 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Jim & Christine Seymour	262.2	Not specified	Considers the lack of play areas for young children and sporting facilities for older children.	Seeks the addition of green spaces.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Seeks that the Council undertake a suburb specific response to assessing the ability of Infrastructure to accommodate impacts on wastewater, water supply and storm water,	Stream 5 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Seeks planting around natural water courses and on steep contours to maintain the steep hillsides under severe weather events.	Stream 8 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Seeks protection of Middleton Road.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.3	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Seeks protection of the Porirua Stream.	Stream 8 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission]	Seeks protection of the Te Awarua-o-Porirua Harbour.	Stream 8 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Marilyn Powell	281.1	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.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Steve Dunn	288.1	Amend	Considers that to do density well there needs to be green infrastructure that requires adequate space in urban planning. Considers that there are studies that demonstrate the value of open space to health.	Amend the plan to include the Council's Green Network Plan as an enforceable key document for greening Wellington.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Steve Dunn	288.2	Amend	Considers that the provision of new public space and well-designed streets is critical as the central city intensifies to ensure the health and wellbeing of the new residents and should have adequate protection for sunlight access and protect from building development or shading.	Seeks that the plan identify open spaces in the City Centre to recognise the need for this green infrastructure along with the Council's Green Network Plan.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Steve Dunn	288.3	Support	Considers that the provision of new public space and well-designed streets is critical as the central city intensifies to ensure the health and wellbeing	Seeks that Frank Kitts Park and Waitangi Park are vested as reserves under the Reserves Act.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				of the new residents and should have adequate protection for sunlight access and protect from building development or shading. Considers that the current provision under the Lambton Harbour plan allows buildings for a Fale Malae on Frank Kitts Park if allowed under a resource consent application. This area has always been open space and a building should be at the transitional building site between Te Papa and Waitangi Park.							
Other / Other / Other	Priscilla Williams	293.1	Not specified	Considers that housing intensification should be targeted to brownfield areas such as Adelaide Road, which has good transport links.	Seeks that housing intensification should be targeted to brownfield areas such as Adelaide Road.	Reject	No	123.6	Support	Considers that council should focus on brownfield development for affordable housing and ensuring high quality there. Considers the impact on the functioning of older neighbourhoods by random placing of high buildings must be prevented.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Tawa Community Board	294.1	Amend	Considers that structure plans are a key tool to encourage larger footprint development or redevelopment. Wishes to ensure that infrastructure is sufficient for the planned more intensive development. Supports encouragement of the redevelopment of seismic limited structures. Ensure the inclusion of adequate community facilities including green spaces, connectivity and laneways. Ensure there is wider scale area planning for climate change effects - minimum floor heights, flood flow zones, and Porirua stream development setbacks. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that a Structure Plan is developed for the Tawa CBD to sit alongside the plan that provides a more holistic community and business development.	Stream 4 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Tawa Community Board	294.2	Not specified	Considers that passing the baton to GWRC in providing the minimum setback measure does not address the problems caused by the intersection between GWRC and WCC responsibilities in this transitional space along the stream edge.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan includes more stringent measures to provide greater protection against increased erosion events along the Porirua Stream.	Stream 8 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Matthew Plummer	300.1	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Roland Sapsford	305.1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Supports Live Wellington's submission. [refer to submission 154]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Roland Sapsford	305.2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Supports Aro Valley Community Council Inc's submission. [refer to submission 87]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Roland Sapsford	305.3	Not specified	[no specific reasons - refer to original submission]	Seeks that a community based planning exercise be undertaken with reference to intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to the revised demolition controls, and that this be completed before significant infrastructure investment.	Reject	No	123.52	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow

Appendix B - General Point - Other

Other / Other / Other	Roland Sapsford	305.4	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Svend Heeselholt Henne Hansen	308.1	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the District Plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.1	Support	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its comments on boundary setbacks: 'it is common for a side, rear or front boundary set back to provide space between buildings. Set-backs can be used to provide a degree of privacy separation between adjoining buildings, allow site access/circulation or to address scale/dominance of buildings in relation to one another. Set backs in the order of 1-3m are common'.	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Lisa Nickson, Garrick Northover and Warren Sakey	313.1	Amend	Considers that the impacts of COVID, migration and remote working should be factored into the council's projections of 50,000 to 80,000 population growth over the next 30 years.	Seeks that the Council's population growth projections be re-assessed.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	oOh!Media Street Furniture New Zealand Limited	316.1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Supports the submission made by Out of Home Media Association of Aotearoa. [Refer to submission 284]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Bruce Crothers	319.1	Not specified	Considers that the Council needs to respond to the climate emergency, as it is indeed an emergency. Radical change is required.	Seeks that Council responds to the climate emergency.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Bruce Crothers	319.2	Not specified	Considers that responding to biodiversity collapse and the climate emergency will require a deliberate reduction in economic activity, less cars, less planes, energy consumption reductions by using less heating and cooling, less wasteful consumption and a return to values of the past that put humans above money.	Seeks reductions in economic activity, energy consumption and wasteful consumption.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Hilary Watson	321.1	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Hilary Watson	321.2	Support	Supports Newtown Residential Association's submission on the topic of extending Character Precincts to houses bordering on Carrara Park.	Supports Newtown Residential Association's submission. [refer to submission 440]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Hilary Watson	321.3	Not specified	Considers that submissions from the public on the Spatial Plan and the District Plan, and the resulting professional advice to Councillors made by Council Officers was disregarded by just over half of councillors.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Hilary Watson	321.4	Support	Supports Red Design's Submission on the Draft District Plan, as it shows how 2000 dwellings can be fitted in around the central spine of Newtown by making use of under-utilised land and going up to six stories.	Supports Red Design's Submission on the Draft District Plan.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Richard Murcott	322.1	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Richard Murcott	322.2	Not specified	Considers that Council should use facts and evidence-based decision-making rather than ideology to drive the PDP.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Richard Murcott	322.3	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that new developments in the Thorndon area require	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

					resource consents, with notification clauses that provide for the community and neighbours to have a say on new developments.						
Other / Other / Other	Tawa Residents Association	328.1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Supports the Tawa Community Board's submission. [refer to submission 294]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Tawa Residents Association	328.2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Supports the Tawa Business Group's submission. [refer to submission 107]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Mt Cook Mobilised	331.1	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Mt Cook Mobilised	331.2	Not specified	Considers that all Community Emergency Hubs should have water tanks on site.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Mt Cook Mobilised	331.3	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that all parks have water tanks on site unless they are within the tsunami hazard zone.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Mt Cook Mobilised	331.4	Not specified	Apartments outside the tsunami zone need to have provision for water tanks in their grounds, in their basements, or in a designated separate storage area within the building. For apartments within the tsunami zone, indoor water storage areas need to be made available on level 5 and above. This is because anyone living below level 5 will have been asked to evacuate. People living above level 5 may be stranded for some time.	Seeks that multi-unit dwellings have provisions for water tanks in their grounds, basements, or in designated separate storage areas within their building.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Mt Cook Mobilised	331.5	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that water tanks be required for all social housing complexes, particularly for new-builds.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Mt Cook Mobilised	331.6	Not specified	Considers that apartment blocks should designate an area for humanure collection, or a long drop. Typically, this could be a wheelie bin and a supply of dry carbon matter, e.g. sawdust, used to cover each layer of contents. The wheelie bin would need to be stored for 6 months before it is safe to be disposed of as compost. The Body Corporate needs to determine how this will be done in each apartment complex, and communicate this to residents.	Seeks that apartments blocks be required to designate an area for humanure collection, or a long drop.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Kerry Finnigan	336.1	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Stream 2 point		68.33	Support	Supports submission that seeks to extend character precincts.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Kerry Finnigan	336.2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Supports submission 275. [Refer to submission 275]	Wrap up point		68.34	Support	Supports submission that seeks to extend character precincts.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Property Council New Zealand	338.1	Not specified	Considers that a whole-of-system approach should be adopted to make strides towards reducing emissions, rather than solely focusing efforts on the elimination of private vehicles. The Golden Mile design consultation earlier this year proposed up to 300 carparks being removed, with final numbers potentially changing. Removing private vehicle use directly contradicts to the Government's commitment towards EVs. The whole-of-system plan should consider a space for private vehicles (moving	Seeks that a whole-of-system approach be adopted to make strides towards reducing emissions.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				towards EV), a freight and transport movement plan, and should encourage sustainable designs within the building sector. [Refer to original submission for full reason]							
Other / Other / Other	Property Council New Zealand	338.2	Not specified	Considers that congestion charging could support the upkeep of connections and infrastructure and support the development of EV charging stations around the city. This would align with the Government and the Council's policies to reduce total net emissions. The introduction of congestion charging should be ringfenced towards the upkeep of connections, infrastructure and EV charging stations around Wellington. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that congestion charging be implemented to support the development of EV charging stations around the city.	Stream 9 point		126.202	Not specified	The RVA does not oppose this submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, The RVA considers that the relief sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provisions.
								128.202	Not specified	Ryman does not oppose this submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, Ryman considers that the relief sought should not apply to retirement villages	Amend Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages from the application of the new provisions.
Other / Other / Other	Tina Reid	341.1	Support	Support the majority of the Mt Cook area as high density would destroy the pre-1930 character of the area, and believe that intensification of housing can happen in much more harmonious ways.	Supports the Mt Cook Mobilised submission. [Refer to submission 331]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.1	Amend	Considers that resource consents' requirements are not properly enforced and offers should be supported and trained to ensure no mistakes are made that require retrospective consents and administrative tasks to be undertaken in order to get the paperwork in line.	Seeks that resource consents are properly enforced.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.2	Not specified	Considers that another density measure based on people, or separate dwellings per hectare and not number of storeys per building should be included in the PDP.	Seeks that a new density measurement based on people per hectare be included.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.3	Not specified	Considers that low-speed and low-traffic improvements would allow greater connections with neighbours in most suburbs.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.4	Not specified	Considers that the maintenance of redevelopment of character houses should be financially supported. Reworking existing buildings has been shown to be more climate-friendly than construction of entirely new structures.	Seeks that renovation activities for character houses be financially supported.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.5	Not specified	Considers that a new scheme needs to be designed that utilises the full scope of grounds available in this case for exemption from NPS height provisions. In order to allow proper consideration of an alternative scheme, the Council needs to complete a design for that new scheme in close consultation with affected stakeholders, and complete a draft evaluation report in support of it. This will preferably be carried out on an explicit co-design basis. It needs to be prepared well in advance of any consultation on proposed revisions to the district plan as it would be fundamental to the shaping of such changes. [Refer to original submission, including Appendix 1]	Seeks that a new NPS height exemption scheme be designed for Mount Victoria, as outlined in Appendix 1. [Refer to original submission and Appendix 1]	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.6	Amend	Considers that new height limits could be introduced incrementally. While the NPS requires sufficient development capacity to be identified	Seeks that new height limits be released and enforced incrementally.	Reject	No	89.97	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington, noting that	Disallow

				for the coming 30 years, it does not require that all of this be made available immediately. Only what is required in the next 3 years needs to be available at any one time. So instead of releasing all the capacity at once, through changing height limits across the suburb overnight, the capacity can be released in blocks. As one block is nearly used up, more can be made available as there is evidence of need. Once there development is channelled to priority areas, the immediate need for new dwellings can be catered to without having to incur costs through sacrificing amenity values before it is clear there is a need for this.						NPSUD capacity requirements are minimums not targets.	
Other / Other / Other	Carolyn Stephens	344.1	Amend	Considers that the plan needs to identify community-based planning for intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to the revised demolition controls.	Seeks that community-based planning for intensification be identified to increase housing supply in areas subject to revised demolition controls.	Reject	No	123.50	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Ryman Healthcare Limited	346.1	Support in part	Supports the Retirement Village Association of New Zealand's submission on the provisions applicable to the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Supports the Retirement Village Association of New Zealand's submission. [refer to submission 350]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Restaurant Brands Limited	349.2	Support	Support	Retain Ngā Hononga i Waenga i Ngā Paparanga Mokowā - Relationships Between Spatial Layers as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.1	Amend	Considers it appropriate to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policy FW.3) and give effect to the RMA	Seeks that any changes through the process that require S32AA evaluation should include matters in Policy FW.3 as appropriate.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.2	Support in part	Supports s32 reports.	Not Specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.3	Amend	Considers it appropriate to have regard to the Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policy FW.3, FW.4, 55 and UD.3) and give effect to the RMA.	Seeks that any changes through the process that require S32AA evaluation should include matters in Policy 55 as appropriate, for any new FUS or any change to relevant residential zones, commercial, industrial or mixed-use zones.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.4	Amend	Considers it appropriate to make decisions based on the best available information and mātauranga Māori, upholding Māori data sovereignty and requiring Māori data and mātauranga Māori to be interpreted within Te Ao Māori.	Seeks to ensure that where Māori data is used, sovereignty is upheld and data is interpreted within Te Ao Māori.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.5	Amend	Considers that to ensure planners and decision makers understand the key natural character values when assessing the potential effects of an activity, and therefore support the protection of natural character, we request that the 2016 Boffa Miskell natural character assessment report is made public.	Seeks to make the 2016 Boffa Miskell natural character assessment report publicly available alongside the PDP.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA

Other / Other / Other	Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.1	Amend	Considers that height limits on apartment blocks should not have exceptions. Notes that these height limits are most likely specified for reasons of safety in steep valleyed and severe earthquake-prone zones; to prevent domination of the city and hills around the harbour by manmade structures; and probably for practical infrastructure reasons. Such reasons should be adhered to for the necessary purposes they were put in place, with no exceptions.	Seeks that height limits be strictly enforced.	Wrap up point		111.158	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Sarah Walker	367.1	Not specified	Considers that a derelict building on the Terrace could be used for apartments as it will have good access to amenities without encroaching on existing homes.	Seeks that a derelict building on the Terrace is used for apartments. [Inferred decision requested]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Elizabeth Nagel	368.1	Not specified	Supports the Live Wellington submission.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		111.207	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Elizabeth Nagel	368.2	Amend	Considers that the plan needs to identify community-based planning for intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to the revised demolition controls.	Seeks that community-based planning for intensification be identified to increase housing supply in areas subject to revised demolition controls.	Reject	no	123.48	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.1	Amend	Considers that provisions of food sources and flight paths for Wellington's birds is an important aspect of Wellington's natural environment.	Seeks that provisions be made in the District Plan to provide for food source and flight paths of local birds. [Inferred decision requested]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.2	Not specified	The Council's previous plantings of kowhai and pōhutukawa in the city to support the indigenous bird life is applauded. The significant increase in indigenous birdlife in the city adds to its uniqueness and character.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.3	Not specified	Considers that the timing and location of development in the city will be a relevant factor in meeting the Atakura - First to Zero emission reduction targets of 57% by 2030 and to net zero by 2050. Emissions from the construction industry have increased by 66 percent in the decade from 2007 - 2017. As well as the carbon footprint of the raw materials used in construction, we need to reduce locked-in or embodied carbon. The large scale demolition of existing homes will have a negative impact on any carbon reduction goals. It is considered that more than half of upfront embodied carbon emissions captured in a building's sub-structure, frame, upper floors and roof, the business case for refurbishing is growing. On average, the carbon footprint of a refurbished building is half that of a newly built	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	123.36	Support	Supports submission because it is considered it is against demolition of pre-1930s homes because of the high CO2 emissions resulting and also from re-building with new materials. Council should control demolition of old buildings and seek to renovate and repurpose them to reduce CO2 emissions.	Allow

				replacement building. The concept of "novelty of new" needs to be rethought.							
Other / Other / Other	Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.4	Not specified	Considers that there currently is sufficient development capacity and that further development capacity can and should be encouraged in existing underutilised brownfields - such Kent Terrace, Cambridge Terrace, south end of Taranaki St and the north end of Adelaide Road. The increased development along this transport spine and in walking distance to the CBD will meet a number of objectives of the Proposed District Plan	Seeks that further development capacity be encouraged in existing underutilised brownfields, such Kent Terrace, Cambridge Terrace, the south end of Taranaki St and the north end of Adelaide Road.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Waka Kotahi	370.3	Amend	Oppose use of 'access allotment' as it is redundant as it duplicates definition of access lot and access strip.	Seeks any consequential changes in the plan to convert "Access Allotment" to "Access Lot".	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Waka Kotahi	370.4	Amend	Oppose use of 'access allotment' as it is redundant as it duplicates definition of access lot and access strip.	Seeks any consequential changes in the plan to change "access strip" to "access lot".	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Waka Kotahi	370.5	Amend	Considers that The operative district plan does not contain provisions to manage noise and vibration effects to new noise sensitive activities established alongside state highway. where there is intensification of noise sensitive activities proposed which has immediate legal effect (such as in HRZ and MRZ zones) the related provisions in the NOISE chapter to manage the effects should also have immediate legal effect (e.g rules in Noise-R3). Is concerned about the risk of intensification occurring alongside state highways which is not designed to appropriately mitigate noise and vibration effects in the existing environment, and the adverse human health and nuisance effects to occupants as a result	Seek that Noise R3 rules have immediate legal effect [Inferred decision requested].	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Jane Szentivanyi	376.1	Not specified	Considers that intensification and density must be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity and heritage of the City. Density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.	Seeks that density be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity and heritage of the City.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Jane Szentivanyi	376.2	Not specified	Considers that Moir Street should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites, given it is designated as a heritage area by Boffa Miskell. Boffa Miskell's recommendation for all character areas is a 5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for any zone adjoining a character area (let alone allowing 28m high buildings). This is based on their extensive studies to maintain acceptable hours of sunlight access to existing buildings, but also compromising to still allow for development to take place. Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt	Seeks that the character, heritage value and sunlight access of Moir Street be protected from the adverse effects of nearby City Centre Zoning standards.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				<p>Victoria. The street is unique, it has a small and diverse community, as well as many historical and cultural qualities that must be preserved from CCZ standards. No other MDRZ has as many character and heritage factors as Moir Street. This means that the specific changes requested in relation avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir St do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans.</p> <p>Development as currently proposed in the draft district plan would have a significant adverse effect on the character, heritage and amenity of houses on both sides of Moir St. You simply cannot mitigate the impacts of buildings which are up to 28.5m tall on a heritage / character area consisting of low lying houses</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>							
Other / Other / Other	Jane Szentivanyi	376.3	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.1	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.2	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
					[Inferred decision requested].						
Other / Other / Other	Wellington Civic Trust	388.1	Amend	Considers that the Wellington Waterfront Framework 2001 should be completed. The Wellington Waterfront Framework 2001 was intended to be Stage One of a three-stage process. Stage two was to prepare detailed plans for each of the sub-areas, and Stage three was an implementation and monitoring stage. The current Framework is thus no more than a framework, as has been pointed out by the Environment Court.	Seeks that the Council completes the unfinished work on the Wellington Waterfront Framework so that it provides greater detail for the future of the distinctive areas of the waterfront.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.1	Not specified	Considers that the extensive opportunities for Taranaki Whānui in Strathmore, that Taranaki Whānui would like opportunities of engagement. [see original submission].	Seeks the opportunity to engage with Council and stakeholders regarding future regeneration opportunities in Strathmore.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.2	Oppose in part	Considers that social and cultural wellbeing has not been adequately provided for within the Proposed District Plan.	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	86.4	Support	Considers it is important that papakainga are allowed for. Considers that there is a problem with Taranaki Whānui's submission is that it is completely open ended about definition, location, size, design, height – and therefore potential	Allow

				<p>The planning framework that has focused on delivering a certain type of suburban and rural development – typically one dwelling per site with no communal buildings/outdoor areas, does not fit with more traditional forms of village living such as Papakainga where tikanga Māori can be practiced.</p> <p>[refer to original submission for full reason]</p>						<p>impacts. Considers that it is quite reasonable that papakainga be allowed in areas where that level of development is anticipated. For example in residential areas allowing 11 metre heights, and the appropriate level of site coverage. That does not apply in ridgelines, special amenity areas, or open space. For Watts Peninsula this again means that a papakainga could well be a result of a master planning exercise, but it would come with some certainty about location, scale etc.</p> <p>Supports the request in part as it applies to zones where housing development of equivalent scale, height, site coverage is expected. For clarity that excludes open space and recreation zones and limits scale in rural areas.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.2]</p>	
Other / Other / Other	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.3	Not specified	<p>Considers that with any decisions made in respect of landholdings over which Taranaki Whānui have an interest in, that Taranaki Whānui are consulted first so as to ensure our interests are given due consideration as required under the RMA and in line with their MOU with Council.</p> <p>[refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that any decisions made in respect of landholdings over which Taranaki Whānui have an interest in, that Taranaki Whānui are consulted first.</p>	Accept in part	No	40.12	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
									2.1	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</p>

									<p>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>		
								2.12	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
								40.1	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>	

Other / Other / Other	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.4	Not specified	Considers that the success of the Proposed District Plan for Taranaki Whānui will be realised through high standards of implementation and ability to operationalise the provisions well. It is expected that: - Tākai Here and Tūpiki Ora will enable resourcing for Taranaki Whānui partnership opportunities with Wellington City Council. - Cultural Capability Programmes will be developed with Taranaki Whānui for successful implementation.	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.5	Amend	Seeks that the interest of the submitter in Shelly Bay is given recognition.	Seeks that the planning framework as set out in the consented Shelly Bay Masterplan and Design Guide is adopted as the default planning settings for the landholdings within the scope of the granted consents.	Stream 4 point		2.2	Oppose	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. 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.	Disallow Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.
								40.2	Oppose	Taranaki Whānui has sold its holdings at Shelly Bay and are no longer, as claimed, 'significant landowners'. Their possible ownership interest in the peninsula as a whole through Right of First Refusal is confined to the Mt Crawford site as the adjacent 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula has been designated reserve by the government (the current landowner) and WCC since 2011. 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. 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. Taranaki Whānui have viewed Shelly Bay as a	Disallow

									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.		
								79.37	Oppose	<p>Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits.” Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points.</p> <p>Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that:</p> <p>“1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings.</p> <p>2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent.”</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui’s commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.</p>	Disallow
Other / Other / Other	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.6	Amend	<p>Considers that the height control area being amended to 27m appropriate, as it is the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent.</p> <p>Submitter seeks that that the planning framework as set out in the consented Shelly Bay Masterplan and Design Guide is adopted as the default planning settings for the landholdings within the scope of the granted consents. Notes that the granted resource consent is currently being implemented on site.</p>	<p>Seeks that any other such amendments that are most appropriate to address increasing permitted heights for Shelly Bay Taikuru.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>	Stream 4 point		2.3	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui has sold the land it owned at Shelly Bay to The Wellington Company for a large development which was consented via the Special Housing Accords Act, thus denying the community any say on the consenting process. Community involvement should be ensured for the future though and the current DP height limit of 11 metres in some areas and the zero height limit in Open Space B land should remain. A recent poll has shown that the wider Wellington public want Shelly Bay included in a National Heritage Park centred on the 76 hectares of Watts Peninsula already designated for a reserve by the Government.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui have treated Shelly Bay solely as a commercial proposition despite disagreement by a large group of its members (Mau Whenua) who occupied the site and opposed its sale, wanting to uphold their cultural and spiritual connection to the land. Mau Whenua continue to oppose the sale of the land at Shelly Bay and should be included by the council in all decisions taken about its future.</p>	<p>Disallow</p> <p>Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.</p>
								26.2	Oppose	<p>The current Operative District Plan allows for heights of 11 metres or less in the suburban</p>	Disallow

									<p>centre area, and zero (buildings not expected at all) in Open Space B land.</p> <p>The Wellington Company–Taranaki Whānui development at Shelly Bay was enabled by the High Court through the HASHA – (“Special Housing Areas”) agreement with intensive scale and impact on the District Plan saying that the default height limits in all SHAs anywhere were 27 metres. We believe that the legislation was completely mis-interpreted. We understand that the granting of this modification in accordance with Taranaki Whanui’s request would mean that any agreed development would for the life of the District Plan as of right be enabled up to 27 metres.</p> <p>A height limit of 27 metres is, in this context, completely inappropriate and antithetical to Open Space values. In addition, the height limit of 27 metres should not be viewed in isolation. Buildings up to a height of 27 metres will have a corresponding increase in local traffic, use of infrastructure and amenities, such that significant investment would be required in relation to the infrastructure before such buildings could be supported. The feasibility of undertaking such upgrades should be considered before any changes to the height limits are made.</p>	
							40.3	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

								79.38	Oppose	Refers to submission 389 states: Taranaki Whānui opposes the extent of the proposed zoning of Shelly Bay Taikuru and the proposed height control limits." Buy Back the Bays opposes the submission on both points. Specifically, the Submission 389 for Taranaki Whānui seeks that: "1. The Mixed Use Zone is extended across the allotments illustrated in Figure Two below or amended to follow the extent of consented development area outlined in the approved masterplan and engineering drawings. 2. The Height Control Area is amended to 27m being the maximum height of development consented under the Shelly Bay Masterplan resource consent." Buy Back the Bays opposes both parts. Buy Back the Bays note that neither part affects Taranaki Whānui's commercial or other interests. Considers that both parts only affect the tall apartment buildings planned by and for the exclusive commercial benefit of The Wellington Company, not the leasing of lower existing buildings that The Wellington Company has offered to Taranaki Whānui as its stake in the project.	Disallow
Other / Other / Other	Grace Ridley-Smith	390.1	Support	Supports the Council Officers' recommendations June 2021 for Mount Victoria	Supports the Council Officers' recommendations June 2021 for Mount Victoria	Stream 2 point		91.54	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted. [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.
Other / Other / Other	Grace Ridley-Smith	390.2	Support	Supports the Council Officers' recommendations June 2021 for other old suburbs (such as Thorndon and Mount Cook etc.).	Supports the Council Officers' recommendations June 2021 for other old suburbs (such as Thorndon and Mount Cook etc.).	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Grace Ridley-Smith	390.3	Support	Supports the heritage scheduling of additional sites identified by Historic Places Wellington.	Seeks that the Heritage Buildings identified by the Historic Places Wellington submission are listed in SCHED3 - Heritage Areas. (Historic Places Wellington Submission 182).	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that any specific sites or buildings that the Council considers to be worthy of protection to be assessed on a site-by-site basis to determine if it meets the definition of historic heritage as set out in s6 of the RMA and propose that those sites or buildings are considered for scheduling in the PDP, including any buildings that the Council considers having historic heritage	Stream 2 point		74.25	Oppose	Considers that the proposal to add Town Centres - ie Newtown, Miramar and Tawa - to the Centres hierarchy is an unnecessary change. There is enough realisable capacity for development even if the PDP is modified to further reduce walking catchments and increase character precincts. Overzoning has many negative effects on the urban environment.	Disallow

					values pre-1930s and should be protected.						
Other / Other / Other	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.2	Support	Considers that a Town Centre zone should be added to the Hierarchy of Centres and to include Miramar, Tawa, and Newtown. Considers that all of these centres provide a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. The introduction of a Town Centre is sought to more appropriately reflect the wider catchment that these geographic centre services (both now and into the future). A proposed chapter with a full set of provisions has been provided with the submission [see submission for further details].	Seeks the addition of a new Town Centre Zone chapter in the proposed District Plan, with: 1. Town Centre Zone provisions in Appendix 2 of the submission [see original submission for full details]. 2. The Miramar commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 3. The Tawa commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 4. The Newtown commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 5. Any consequential updates to the Plan to account for the introduction of a Town Centre Zone. 6. Amendments to planning maps are made as shown in Appendix 4 of this submission [see original submission for full details]. Any consequential updates to maps.	Stream 4 point		63.2	Oppose	Considers that the proposal to add Town Centres - ie Newtown, Miramar and Tawa - to the Centres hierarchy is an unnecessary change. As outlined in the submission appendix of Kāinga Ora's original submission, the primary purpose seems to be to justify increasing the walking catchments and increasing permitting building heights up to 8 storeys. Newtown Residents' Association original submission (#440) outlines that there is enough realisable capacity for development even if the PDP is modified to further reduce walking catchments and increase character precincts. The rationale for the Kainga Ora submission is that maximising development is desirable and leads to a "well functioning urban environment". We argue that zoning for vastly more development than will be realised in the foreseeable future is counter productive and has many negative effects on the urban environment. [Inferred reference to submission 391.2]	Disallow
								68.3	Oppose	Submitter opposes new Town Centre Zone to be added to Newtown including corresponding objectives.	Disallow
								74.26	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchments in PDP are already too large - reducing them can still provide predicted development capacity.They should be reduced to avoid negative effects on the community.	Disallow
								82.62	Oppose	Considers an additional layer in the hierarchy of centres adds undue complexity. Not necessary for a small-medium city such as Wellington.	Disallow
								84.17	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow Seeks that SNAs are applied to all zones where relevant criteria are met.
Other / Other / Other	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.3	Amend	Considers that a Town Centre zone should be added to the Hierarchy of Centres and to include Miramar, Tawa, and Newtown. Considers that all of these centres provide a range of commercial, community, recreational and residential activities that service the needs of the immediate and neighbouring suburbs. The introduction of a Town Centre is sought to more appropriately reflect the wider catchment that these geographic centre services (both now and into the future). A proposed chapter with a full set of provisions has been provided with the submission [see submission for further details].	Seeks the addition of a new Town Centre Zone chapter in the proposed District Plan, with: 1. Town Centre Zone provisions in Appendix 2 of the submission [see original submission for full details]. 2. The Miramar commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details]. 3. The Tawa commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4	Stream 4 point		63.3	Oppose	Newtown Residents' Association submit that the walkable catchments in the PDP are certainly adequate to allow more than enough realisable development capacity, and could be reduced further. Zoning for more development than needed has unintended negative consequences. [Inferred reference to submission 391.3]	Disallow
								80.10	Oppose	Considers an additional layer in the hierarchy of centres adds undue complexity. Considers it is not necessary for a small-medium city such as Wellington. Seeks to retain hierarchy of centres and definition of Local Centres as notified.	Disallow
								82.63	Oppose	Considers an additional layer in the hierarchy of centres adds undue complexity. Not necessary for a small-medium city such as Wellington.	Disallow
								84.18	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of	Disallow Seeks that additional provisions

					<p>[see original submission for full details] .</p> <p>4. The Newtown commercial centre is zoned as a Town Centre Zone as sought in this submission and on the planning maps in Appendix 4 [see original submission for full details].</p> <p>5. Any consequential updates to the Plan to account for the introduction of a Town Centre Zone.</p> <p>6. Amendments to planning maps are made as shown in Appendix 4 of this submission [see original submission for full details].</p> <p>Any consequential updates to maps.</p>					water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
Other / Other / Other	Murray Pillar	393.1	Support	Supports the Boffa Miskell 2019 report.	Seeks to amend the character precincts to reflect the area recommended in the Boffa Miskell 2019 report.	Stream 2 point		69.76	Support	Boffa Miskell - adoption Boffa Miskell – support definitions and include all Add Character Precincts to areas missed 10min walkable catchment Character precincts and rules Character precincts for all sites identified by Boffa M. Establish Character Precincts where they were missed resource consents for demolishing pre-1930s dwellings	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.1	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.2	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale. [Inferred decision requested].	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Stephen Minto	395.1	Oppose	<p>Considers that the assumption of undersupply of housing driving housing prices up and fixing this problem by increasing the supply of houses to drive down prices is false and will not deliver affordable housing.</p> <p>The real problem is not a housing supply shortage but excessive demand for the usage of housing for purposes other than long-term residence. This includes: short-term rentals for tourists e.g. Airbnb and holidays; Overseas</p>	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	123.4	Support	<p>Considers that in Inner City areas, expensive new high rise buildings will not provide resident living space but be used for short term rental. Considers that this will not provide affordable housing which should be the focus of Council.</p> <p>Considers that council should focus on brownfield development for affordable housing and ensuring high quality there. Considers the impact on functioning of older neighbourhoods by random placing of high buildings must be prevented.</p>	Allow

				<p>students; High pre-Covid immigration; Superannuation/Income investments; and "build to rent".</p> <p>The private market, with its economic imperative to maximise profit, simply does not work to set prices by using demand and supply. These reasons mean that intensification does not result in affordable housing. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>							
Other / Other / Other	Stephen Minto	395.2	Oppose	<p>Considers that under the Local Government Act 2002, section 10.1, the purpose of Council is to 'enable democratic local decision making'. Granting permission to developers to build up to six-stories without a right of complaint is not in alignment with promoting democracy and an abdication to an elite, and often wealthy few.</p> <p>Changes to intensification in the District Plan will not deliver affordable housing and therefore Council will be in breach of its purpose to promote social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	123.5	Support	<p>Considers that in Inner City areas, expensive new high rise buildings will not provide resident living space but be used for short term rental. Considers that this will not provide affordable housing which should be the focus of Council.</p> <p>Considers that council should focus on brownfield development for affordable housing and ensuring high quality there. Considers the impact on functioning of older neighbourhoods by random placing of high buildings must be prevented.</p>	Allow
Other / Other / Other	David Cadman	398.1	Amend	<p>Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.</p>	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	David Cadman	398.2	Support	<p>Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.</p>	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	David Cadman	398.3	Support	<p>[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].</p>	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.1	Amend	<p>Expresses concern that 60% of the proposed district plan is notified using ISPP, rendering it unappealable.</p> <p>Considers that it is unclear how progressing the Natural Hazards chapter through the ISPP will give effect to one of the mandatory outcomes, and therefore questions why the entire chapter is being progressed through ISPP.</p> <p>Considers that it is unclear how the hearing process will work for chapters that are partly</p>	The submitter seeks that the matters relating to notification under the ISPP is appropriately rectified to ensure that only chapters/provisions which qualify to be notified under the ISPP are notified under the ISPP, and everything else is notified under Schedule 1.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				<p>processed through Schedule 1 and partly through the ISPP.</p> <p>Considers that decisions from the ISPP cannot be appealed which significantly limits the opportunity for the provisions to be considered, which could have significant ramifications particularly for district-wide provisions and overlays such as those mentioned above.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>							
Other / Other / Other	Cheryl Robilliard	409.1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks the relief requested by the Newtown Residents' Association with respect to sunlight protection to parks and reserves.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Cheryl Robilliard	409.2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks the relief requested by submitter Paul Forrest with respect to ecosystems in the context of densification and green corridors and biodiversity within the inner city and inner city suburbs Mt Victoria and Newtown.	Stream 8 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Cheryl Robilliard	409.3	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Amend the plan to include the Wellington City Council Green Network Plan as an enforceable key document for greening Wellington.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Cheryl Robilliard	409.4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Amend the Wellington City Council Green Network Plan to include Newtown and Mount Victoria.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Emma Osborne	410.1	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Emma Osborne	410.2	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the District Plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Emma Osborne	410.3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.2	Support	<p>Considers that local and overseas research has shown that heritage contributes to positive economic, environmental, social, and cultural wellbeing outcomes.</p> <p>Considers that Seville, Graz and Copenhagen are good examples of cities that have strong heritage values.</p>	Not specified	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

Other / Other / Other	Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.3	Support	Considers that heritage and character can make a significant contribution to the city's climate change goals by reducing emissions and waste through sustainable resource use and mitigating the effects of climate change through building community cohesion and resilience.	Not specified	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.4	Amend	Considers that an approach where consent fees are fixed and payable upfront is an approach used in other places which NZ is frequently compared to such as Victoria and the United Kingdom. In these places the cost of planning permission is substantially lower than it is in New Zealand.	Seeks that the Council investigate making resource consent fees fixed and payable up front, depending on the cost of the activities being applied for.	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that Council continue its program of waiving resource consent fees for heritage items as an incentive to keep places in sustainable use.	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.6	Oppose	Considers that the lack of public consultation throughout the planning process combined with flawed analysis, particularly around character areas, has resulted in a schedule that does not adequately protect historic heritage nor reflect what Wellingtonians value.	Not specified.	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.7	Not specified	Considers that the methodology that has been used for selecting potential new places to add to the schedule is unclear. Considers that the section 32 analysis has limited information about the methodology used. States there is no heritage study listed in the technical assessments, reports and background content informing the Proposed District Plan. Considers that the work undertaken to review the schedule outlined in the relevant section 32 analysis report is ad hoc in nature, is not indicative of the expected methodology for a professional heritage study.	Not specified	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.8	Not specified	Considers that the Council has not adequately sought the views of the community on historic heritage in the development of the PDP. The submitter notes that the section 32 report notes engagement with owners, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, Thorndon and Mt Victoria heritage groups on proposed new heritage listings but not with the general public. Considers that there was no awareness campaign activity commonly undertaken by TAs occurring, such as social media posts, newsletter content, or press releases, for example. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B -General Point - Other

Other / Other / Other	Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.9	Not specified	Considers that as the submissions on the draft district plan also included nominations for heritage listings that this is indicative of a lack of public engagement.	Not specified.	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.10	Not specified	Considers that much of the character areas are likely to meet the threshold for scheduling as historic heritage for their historical and physical significance.	Seeks that the Council apply the Greater Wellington Regional Council 'Guide to historic heritage identification' to assess the value of the character areas.	Stream 3 point		91.10	Support	The further submitter supports the point that there are significant weaknesses in the Council's process and their proposal lacks evidence - including the proposed listings in SCHED1. The further submitter supports this view and have also been disappointed with the Council's lack of diligence and rigor applied to justifying the original submitters proposal. The RMA sets clear requirements in s32 Clause 1(c) that the evaluation must contain a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal. This requirement has not been met by the Council's evaluation. [See original further submission for full reason].	Allow Seeks that the Council commission a study to improve understanding and quantify the value the community places on heritage across different types of heritage including isolated homes not visible or accessible to the public.
Other / Other / Other	Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.11	Oppose	Considers that the Pre-1930s character area Boffa Miskell review 2019 was based on a flawed analysis character areas. Considers that the review elevated original built form over pre-1930s character as described in the operative district plan.	Not specified.	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.12	Not specified	Considers that there is a lack of evidence indicating that the existing heritage and character provisions in the District Plan are affecting the housing market in Wellington. Considers that the Council's 2019 HBA does not include any analysis of the impacts of heritage and character provisions on the housing market in Wellington. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.13	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Council to lobby the government to improve resource consent processes to make them more cost effective and less risky.	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.14	Support	Considers that historically this is how housing shortages have been solved in New Zealand and that affordable and good quality housing has only been delivered in Aotearoa/NZ when the government has been a significant player in the housing market - either through cheap mortgage finance or by building dwellings itself.	Seeks that the Council continue to invest in social housing and lobby central Government to provide it.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	VicLabour	414.1	Not specified	Considers that small groups of people have had a disproportionate influence on Council planning processes, particularly homeowners with a vested interest in slowing change to our urban form. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Council centres the needs of those worst affected by the realities and locked-in future challenges for the status quo. [inferred decision requested]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA

Other / Other / Other	VicLabour	414.2	Support	Supportive of Council taking a partnership approach within a Te Tiriti framework, especially in relation to sites and areas of significance to Māori.	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	VicLabour	414.3	Not specified	Considers that there is a saturation of colonial/settler monuments in the city, and mana whenua should be partnered with and empowered to shape the future of the city. Considers that as part of this Council should change current design rather than only taking a Te Tiriti approach for future developments.	Seeks that mana whenua are partnered with and empowered to shape the future of the city and as part of this council should change current design rather than only taking a Te Tiriti approach for future developments.	Accept in part	No	38.117	Support	The submitter seeks that mana whenua are partnered with and empowered to shape the future of the city and as part of this council should change current design rather than only taking a Te Tiriti approach for future developments. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira support this submission because mana whenua should be empowered to achieve their aspirations for Te Whanganui a Tara.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	VicLabour	414.4	Not specified	Supported the introduction of rent controls for council tenants on low incomes until at least Income related rent subsidy is realised, wages go up substantially or inflation is under control	Seeks that a rent to buy scheme, perhaps in partnership with central government is introduced. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No	136.29	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
Other / Other / Other	VicLabour	414.5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that land be made available for infrastructure corridors, particularly the proposed MRT Southern spine corridor making sure that housing, transport, and other uses are well catered for.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	VicLabour	414.6	Amend	Considers that the district plan does not go far enough to address climate change and that meeting the challenge presented by climate change must be a key focus through the district plan. [see original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the district plan be amended to create a legal obligation for carbon emissions to be controlled and budgeted in a time-bound way within wellington city.	Reject	No	91.31	Support	The further submitter agrees that making changes to a heritage listed building is a very fraught, uncertain, and costly process. There is also risk that regimes change and become more restrictive in the future at further cost to property owners. The further submitter does not believe the community values associated with the heritage of the Gordon Wilson Flats (which the further submitter thinks are low) outweigh the costs of protection. The Council should evaluate the listing under s32 of the RMA and quantify the costs and	Allow Seeks that Item 299 (Gordon Wilson Flats) is removed from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings (unless the Council can demonstrate a net benefit to retaining it in the schedule) The Council commission a study to improve understanding and quantify the value the community

										benefits to inform their decisions. While the University is a large enough organisation to employ lawyers and team to fight its own battles, private home owners are simply not equipped with the resources to challenge heritage process. The further submitter discusses this issue in terms of the power imbalance and incentives of the Council in sections of their submission "The Council is naturally incentivised to over-provide Heritage protection" and "There is a significant power imbalance between the Council and isolated homeowners". [See original further submission for full reason].	places on heritage across different types of heritage including isolated homes not visible or accessible to the public. The Council only list buildings where there is a net benefit to the community of doing so. Identify the effects of listing and quantify the costs and benefits to a level of detail that corresponds to the scale and significance the effect imposed by heritage listing (as required in s32 of the RMA).
Other / Other / Other	Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.1	Not specified	Considers Wellington, like many cities is under pressure from rapid growth and demographic changes, 'crumbling' and deficient infrastructure, supply and affordability housing issues for renters and first-time home buyers, societal demand for greater sustainability considerations, and resilience to climate change just to name a few. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments]	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.14	Not specified	Considers that the Council should refer to guidance provided by the Ministry for the Environment, the NZ Treasury, the RMA and the Office of Best Practice Regulation in Australia. Guidance should be reviewed when undertaking evaluations of the impacts of proposed policies and changes on community value, cost-benefit analysis and non-use and community values. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Seeks that Council use guidance from the Ministry for the Environment, the NZ Treasury, the RMA and the Office of Best Practice Regulation in Australia to better evaluate the impacts of Heritage listings. [Inferred decision requested]	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.15	Not specified	Considers the listing of 28 Robieson Street on the heritage schedule should proceed through a Schedule 1 process, rather than the ISPP [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments]	Seeks that the listing of 28 Robieson Street on the heritage schedule should proceed through a Schedule 1 process, rather than the ISPP [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No	16.6	Support	Absence of accountability and fair presentation of evidence through denying a right of appeal through applying the ISPP instead of the RMA process.	Allow Seeks that 28 Robieson Street be wholly removed from Schedule 1 'Heritage Buildings'.
								76.5	Support	The submitter (415) highlight the following legal point: that the inclusion of new heritage listings in the ISPP, NPS-UD or MDRS is inappropriate, and there is insufficient justification for them. The Submitters (415) point to the legal misrepresentation WCC is using to justify the lack of right to appeal which does not follow the WCC's own requirements for natural justice. The further submitter concurs with their assertion.	Allow Delete Item 514 (28 Robieson St) from SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings. Allow all private homeowners the right to appeal in order for justice to occur. Seeks that Council: -seek and make publicly available an independent legal evaluation of the the councils inclusion of heritage scheduling of new listings in the ISPP process, and if the proposed WCC's inclusion of inaccessible private homes are aligned with the independent evaluation
Other / Other / Other	Thomas John Broadmore	417.1	Not specified	Supports the submission of Il Casino Body Corporate.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Thomas John Broadmore	417.2	Not specified	Supports the submission of Juliet Broadmore on the point on the use of Viewshaft area as	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				greenspace.							
Other / Other / Other	Penny Griffith	418.1	Not specified	Supports the submission of Historic Places Wellington.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Penny Griffith	418.2	Amend	Considers that the 40km/hr speed zone in Oriental Bay doesn't interface well with nearby 50km/hr zones because drivers don't react to 10km/hr changes in speed limit - compounded by the fact that there's many pedestrians. [See original submission for full reasons]	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Penny Griffith	418.3	Amend	Considers that the New World supermarket adjacent to Waitangi Park creates a busy roundabout , with many lane changes and pedestrian activity making it dangerous. [See original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.1	Amend	[No specific reason beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan add a new objective that recognises the positive value of participation in decisions on an ongoing basis, and acknowledge that this is central to communities being able to meet their needs on an ongoing basis.	Reject	No	123.39	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.2	Amend	[No specific reason beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is more rigirously tested against the objectives to ensure that the Council's chosen methods are the best options to deliver on the objectives of the Plan.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.3	Amend	Considers that many sites in the city are under utilised and that filling these gaps will provide for future housing needs without impacting quality, amenity and character.	Seeks that the proposed district plan add a clear sequence for intensification, done through zoning, that follows the sequence set out in the Spatial Plan and that it focus on major areas of underutilised land and smaller groups of under utilised sites close to public transport.	Reject	No	123.40	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.4	Amend	Considers that Wellingtonians will relish the challenge of working together. Some suburbs such are Newtown are proactively taking a lead in rethinking their localities. Such initiatives create a sense of community, enhance democracy and deliver change in ways that build on community strengths. Seeks that participatory design projects, coupled with clear housing targets, so communities are involved in welcoming new people. Imposing arbitrary change when better options exist simply fosters local resentment.	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to be amended to identify a sequence of communities which will be involved in community-based planning, based on the sequence set out in the Spatial Plan.	Reject	No	123.41	Support	Considers that for a harmonious and involved citizenry, community deliberative processes are necessary to decide where development and intensification can take place in their local area. Seeks each community participates in deciding where, in their local area, high rise intensification is appropriate.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.5	Amend	Considers that Wellingtonians will relish the challenge of working together. Some suburbs such are Newtown are proactively taking a lead in	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan needs to be amended to make greater provision for limited	Stream 2 point		123.33	Support	Considers that the submission requests notification for high rise building effects on surrounding housing with regard to sunlight,	Allow Seeks that council instate

				<p>rethinking their localities. Such initiatives create a sense of community, enhance democracy and deliver change in ways that build on community strengths.</p> <p>Seeks that participatory design projects, coupled with clear housing targets, so communities are involved in welcoming new people. Imposing arbitrary change when better options exist simply fosters local resentment.</p>	notification (as opposed to non-notification) in relation to light, shading, privacy and wind effects so as to enable and support fair and reasonable compromises between neighbours.					shade, wind and more, and that such notification is essential for neighbourhoods to thrive, for community relations to be good and citizenry to be involved in their community.	notification procedures as requested.
Other / Other / Other	Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.6	Amend	<p>Considers that local government, central government agencies, private developers, and communities need to work in partnership not as adversaries.</p> <p>Considers that Wellington needs innovative models for public and private investment working together to rapidly develop Wellington's large areas of underutilised land into high quality housing, greenspace and small business facilities.</p> <p>Current proposals assume a meagre 14% of rezoned areas will be developed.</p> <p>LIVE WELLington wants to see partnerships that can realise the potential of at least half our underutilised land in the next ten years.</p>	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan includes an assessment of housing capacity in Wellington that is based on a target of realising at least 50% of the development capacity (as measured under the Operative Plan) on underutilised land over the term of the draft Plan, and that the draft Plan needs to include methods to achieve this.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Johnsonville Community Association	429.1	Amend	<p>Considers that re-zoning rural land for urban purposes is needed to provide more space for affordable housing.</p> <p>Takapu Valley and Ohariu Valley has been land-banked by developers. These areas can potentially account for 25% of future population growth.</p>	Seeks that Wellington City Council review the prohibition on rezoning rural land for urban purposes.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Johnsonville Community Association	429.2	Amend	<p>Considers that since Johnsonville residential area was zoned as Medium Density that many non-compliant and substandard multi-unit developments have been built.</p> <p>Considers that if a review was done of this area that it would be found that District Plan Change 72 did not achieve its promised levels of high quality, high density housing.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that WCC complete an independent review of the MDRAs to determine if the objectives in DPC72 have been met and confirm the WCC has successfully permitted "Density Done Well" developments. This review should provide a clear list of Do's and Don'ts for future housing development within the city.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Johnsonville Community Association	429.3	Amend	<p>Considers that the New Zealand Motu Study identified the property value effect of each hour of sunlight lost, valuing it at around 2.4% per hour lost.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that WCC undertake independent monitoring of what happens to Wellington Property Market prices when properties are surrounded by High Density Developments over 3 storeys versus those that aren't.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Johnsonville Community Association	429.4	Not specified	<p>Considers that Amenity Values are protected under the Resource Management Act, and are valuable - inferring that any loss of amenity value should be compensated for.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA

Other / Other / Other	Johnsonville Community Association	429.5	Amend	Considers that neighbouring properties losing amenities and value because of nearby 6 or more storey high density accommodation housing located in the outer suburbs is essentially an economic wealth transfer from those residents to the developer without compensation.	Seeks that the PDP include a compensation framework for neighbouring residents who suffer a loss of value and amenity due to nearby high density accommodation housing developments. [See original submission for further details on this framework]	Wrap up point		107.1	Oppose	Stride is opposed to a compensation framework for neighbouring residents of high-density housing developments as this could impose inappropriate costs on development.	Disallow
								108.1	Oppose	Investore is opposed to a compensation framework for neighbouring residents of high-density housing developments as this could impose inappropriate costs on development.	Disallow
Other / Other / Other	Johnsonville Community Association	429.6	Not specified	Considers that because the Wellington RLTP says that decisions around intensification around Rapid Transit stops will be considered during the District Planning process, and the PDP does not have a definition of Rapid Transit, the classification of Johnsonville line or any other transit as Rapid Transit is not supported by the Wellington RLPT.	Seeks that WCC release the criteria used to determine which public transport stops are rapid transit stops and/or "commercial centres and with good public transport accessibility" deemed suitable for a MDRZ.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Johnsonville Community Association	429.7	Amend	Considers that Johnsonville is expected to have the highest population growth of any wellington suburb and needs infrastructure investment to account for this. Considers that Johnsonville has a high level of traffic and there are many uncompleted road projects. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that WCC complete planned roading improvements for the Johnsonville Triangle.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Johnsonville Community Association	429.8	Amend	Considers that Johnsonville is expected to have the highest population growth of any wellington suburb and needs infrastructure investment to account for this. Considers that Johnsonville has a high level of traffic and there are many uncompleted road projects. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that WCC support planned growth in Johnsonville.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Johnsonville Community Association	429.9	Support	Considers tha Johnsonville lacks public parking and green space and that the site of the old johnsonville library is a good opportunity. It is the inly WCC owned site in the triangle, it is sunny, sheltered and a decent distance from other green space, and there are other sites that can be repurposed for social housing.	Supports the completion of the Green Space Review for Johnsonville.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Johnsonville Community Association	429.10	Amend	Considers tha Johnsonville lacks public parking and green space and that the site of the old johnsonville library is a good opportunity. It is the inly WCC owned site in the triangle, it is sunny, sheltered and a decent distance from other green space, and there are other sites that can be repurposed for social housing.	Seeks that development of the Old Library Site in Johnsonville is postponed until Green Space Review is complete.	Wrap up point		80.48	Support	Support the submission regarding more provision for green space in Johnsonville and generally throughout the city.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Johnsonville Community Association	429.11	Amend	Considers that while Johnsonville does have some public facilities including the new public library and the Alex Moore sports ground, there is a shortage of other facilities. Perhaps the most obvious is the lack of any indoor sports stadium. Other major suburbs have such a facility	Seeks that the WCC outline the specific planned investments that require further investment in facilities and infrastructure, with regard to Indoor sports stadium, parks, greenspace, public	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				including Tawa, Ngaio, Newtown and Kilbirnie	transport and roading. [Inferred Decision Requested]						
Other / Other / Other	Johnsonville Community Association	429.12	Amend	Submitter is concerned at the lack of supporting information in justifying these major changes in PDP urban planning rules for Johnsonville.	Seeks that further information be released on the justification of both the rapid transit stop walking catchment MDRZs and the metropolitan walking catchment MDRZ.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Kat Hall	430.1	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Kat Hall	430.2	Support	Supports Red Design's Submission on the Draft District Plan, as their 'proof of concept' plan show that intensification along the main streets, and mostly within existing Suburban Centres zoning, could provide up to 2,000 or more new dwellings. This far exceeds the current projections of the Draft Spatial Plan for the whole Newtown area.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Anna Kemble Welch	434.1	Support	Supports Red Design's Submission on the Draft District Plan, as it shows the potential for development of increased housing while retaining the historic frontages of the old shops. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Supports Red Design's Submission on the Draft District Plan. [Inferred decision requested]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Anna Kemble Welch	434.2	Support	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Pre-1930 Character Area Review, Boffa Miskell Report.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Anna Kemble Welch	434.3	Support	Supports Newtown Resident's Association's submission on the extension of Newtown's character Precinct, sunlight access and their point related to MDRZ sites with parks and open space in the neighbourhood.	Supports Newtown Residents' Association submission. [Refer to submission 440]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Paul M Blaschke	435.1	Oppose	The decision from Council's Planning & Environment Committee to remove SNAs from all residentially zoned properties on 23 June 2022 is opposed. This decision renders the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity section much less effective than it could and should be. It greatly hinders the achievement of Council's Te Atakura blueprint and other moves towards sustainability and resilience. It disadvantages the great majority of the city's residents except for a tiny number of suburban residential landowners who become privileged over all others including other suburban residential landowners with portions of SNAs within their properties and who have welcomed or not objected to the provisions. It overturns the very good process adopted by the council team and consultants who have planned and undertaken the SNA survey and policy development. Finally, it renders ECO-O1, ECO-P1, ECO-P2, and ECO-P3, and the rules supporting these objectives and policies, incapable of being properly implemented, and perpetuates the uncertainty caused by lack of a comprehensive statutory process around significant areas and indigenous biodiversity. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Opposes the decision from Council's Planning & Environment Committee to remove Significant Natural Areas from all residentially zoned properties.	Stream 8 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

Other / Other / Other	Newtown Residents' Association	440.1	Support	Supports Red Design's Submission on the Draft District Plan, as it demonstrated how new buildings on only 45% of Mansfield Street escarpment area could provide at least 2000 sunny, accessible, comfortable new apartments, while retaining the historic character of the Riddiford St shops. Planned intensification along Newtown's main streets is supported. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Supports Red Design's Submission on the Draft District Plan.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Newtown Residents' Association	440.2	Support	Supports the Planning for Residential Amenity, Boffa Miskell Report.	Supports the Planning for Residential Amenity, Boffa Miskell Report.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Newtown Residents' Association	440.3	Not specified	Considers that there are environmental effects associated with demolition and rebuilding. New buildings, particularly high rises, are very carbon intensive. On the other hand, existing timber houses represent a great deal of embodied energy and sequestered carbon. Many have been adapted and upgraded over time, which is more environmentally sustainable than replacing them. Furthermore, these buildings are resilient and have survived 100+ years of earthquakes, while many new buildings in Wellington have been badly damaged in earthquakes.	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	123.35	Support	Supports submission because it is considered it is against demolition of pre-1930s homes because of the high CO2 emissions resulting and also from re-building with new materials. Council should control demolition of old buildings and seek to renovate and repurpose them to reduce CO2 emissions.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Save Our Venues	445.1	Oppose	Considers that there are significant issues with current Noise Control enforcement processes. Considers that the current methodology of measuring sound is subjective and places the onus on the complainant. The response from noise control officers is then exclusively a punitive process. This can create a huge scope for loss of income and confidence in the venue. A model where measuring the sound at the boundary of the property from where the sound is emanating, as well as inside the complainant's property, would enable Council to ensure that both the venue and the residential property are compliant with noise standards and acoustic mitigation standards respectively. This will allow for mediation between both parties and ensure reasonable steps can be taken to mitigate noise before the venue is restricted in its ability to operate at all. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the WCC reforms its Noise Control enforcement processes, equipping officers with decibel meters and requiring that an objective measurement demonstrating non-compliance be recorded before an infringement notice can be issued or enforcement action taken.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Save Our Venues	445.2	Oppose	Considers that there should also be the consideration that the sound of live music is inherently a different frequency to the sound of amplified recorded music or the normal environmental sounds of living in the city and should be measured to a standard that takes that into account.	Seeks that there should be separate consideration that the sound of live music, due to its frequency. [Inferred decision requested]	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				[Refer to original submission for full reason]							
Other / Other / Other	Kay Larsen	447.2	Not specified	Considers that it seems impossible to imagine allowing developers to demolish existing houses without public notification so that the local community can work together to improve the neighbourhood. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Dale Mary McTavish	448.1	Not specified	Opposes recent examples of infill housing. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Dale Mary McTavish	448.2	Not specified	Considers that the Newtown shopping strip needs to be viable, which means parking for cars outside the shops, and the character needs to be kept.	Seeks that parking for cars outside shops on the Newtown shopping strip are kept.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Peter Jack	450.1	Not specified	Considers that more catchment or reservoir storage be looked at for the future. With all this excessive water we are getting in the winter now rather than let it go, store it.	Not specified.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Graham Thomas Stewart	451.1	Support	The submitter wants to follow the Councils (Kainga Ora's) proposal for 300 houses to be built [at Arlington Development in Mt Cook, Wellington].	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	David Lee	454.1	Not specified	Considers there is the Climate change issue to consider. Demolishing wooden heritage housing (which the Plan will allow of right) will release carbon into the atmosphere. Considers that more carbon will be used in building replacements made of concrete, steel and glass. 'Old is greener than new'.	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	123.34	Support	Supports submission because it is considered it is against demolition of pre-1930s homes because of the high CO2 emissions resulting and also from re-building with new materials. Council should control demolition of old buildings and seek to renovate and repurpose them to reduce CO2 emissions.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	(Vivien) Jane Kirkcaldie and Denis Maxwell Kirkcaldie	455.1	Oppose	Opposes the creation of canyons within the submitters' area (the Botanic Gardens and Bolton St Cemetery, the motorway and the cable car track), from multi-floor buildings. Considers that the area is steep and hilly, subject to seismic activity as the city in general, and the service infrastructure is old.	Not specified.	Stream 4 point		123.20	Support	Considers that Wesley Precinct and Lower Kelburn, the area between Bolton St to San Sebastian Rd or the cable car, and between the Botanic Gardens and the Motorway should be classified as a Character Precinct with demolition controls and height limit of 11m for the many reasons outlined the submission and others referred to in further submission, including that of Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood, submission 356.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	(Vivien) Jane Kirkcaldie and Denis Maxwell Kirkcaldie	455.2	Not specified	Considers that functioning, well-maintained houses in our area built before the 1930s should retain protection from demolition. Considers that people have worked hard in their jobs to be able to choose single dwellings to live their lives in this area and they take pride and love in maintaining the houses and gardens. These in turn reflect the history and stories of our city.	Not specified.	Stream 2 point		123.21	Support	Considers that Wesley Precinct and Lower Kelburn, the area between Bolton St to San Sebastian Rd or the cable car, and between the Botanic Gardens and the Motorway should be classified as a Character Precinct with demolition controls and height limit of 11m for the many reasons outlined the submission and others referred to in further submission, including that of Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood, submission 356.	Allow
Other / Other / Other	Chris Horne, Sunita Singh, Julia Stace, Paul Bell-Butler	456.1	Support	Supports the protection of indigenous plant communities for their own sake and for their carbon-sequestration function. This is of increasing importance in the battle to limit global climate change and rising sea levels.	Not specified.	Stream 8 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Marilyn Head	457.1	Support	Support the Newtown Residents Association submission. [Refer to submission number 440 for full details].	Support the Newtown Residents Association submission. [Refer to submission number 440	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA

					for full details].							
Other / Other / Other	Marilyn Head	457.2	Not specified	Considers that Council should instead support redevelopment and repurposing of existing buildings, or, where necessary, rebuilding on similar scales. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA		NA
Other / Other / Other	Marilyn Head	457.3	Not specified	Considers that Council should regulate to prevent land banking and unused sites/buildings, requiring cleared sites to be available as temporary parks if building has not commenced within a specified period. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA		NA
Other / Other / Other	Marilyn Head	457.4	Support	Considers the recreational outdoor space to built space needs to be increased and levies charged for parks and recreation must be made into law to ensure that these facilities are available in the area. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks to introduce fees for entrance into parks to ensure that these facilities are available in the areas not aggregated into public spaces like the waterfront. [inferred decision requested].	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA		NA
Other / Other / Other	Marilyn Head	457.5	Not specified	Considers the plan does not factor in infrastructure requirements	not specified.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA		NA
Other / Other / Other	Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.1	Not specified	Considers there to be insufficient evidence of Brooklyn suburbs character or heritage value.	Seeks for WCC to investigate Character/ Heritage in the Brooklyn suburb.	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA		NA
Other / Other / Other	Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.2	Not specified	Consideration given to topography, not just roads on a map for development.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA		NA
Other / Other / Other	Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.1	Support	Supports the LIVE WELLington submission in its entirety.	Supports the LIVE WELLington submission (submission 154) in its entirety.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA		NA
Other / Other / Other	Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.2	Not specified	Considers that WCC needs to redress some of the housing market failure and become a market maker and standards setter through actively fostering development on key sites.	Seeks that Wellington City Council actively fosters development through targeting properties for acquisition, engaging designers, consenting a plan, and then onselling the package to developers.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA		NA
Other / Other / Other	Philip Cooke	465.1	Amend	Considers that the heritage assessment of Item 471 (20 Austin Street) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings should be amended to remove protection of the roof design. The unusual arrangement or intriguing roof design is highlighted in the Physical Values and Rarity as of importance. The submitter considers that this feature was originally intended to be hidden from view. The roof's internal gutters are a problematic design which have resulted in damaging leaks twice in the last 23 years and would benefit from re-configuration.	Seeks that the heritage assessment of Item 471 (20 Austin Street) is amended to remove protection of the roof design.	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA		NA

Other / Other / Other	Philip Cooke	465.2	Amend	<p>Considers that the heritage assessment of Item 471 (20 Austin Street) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings should be amended with regard to its description of 'Age' under Physical Values.</p> <p>Considers that the description has "the place is particularly old in the context of human occupation in the Wellington region" but it should be amended to reflect that the house is old in the "context of European occupation of Mount Victoria".</p>	Seeks that the heritage assessment of Item 471 (20 Austin Street) is amended in its description of 'Age under Physical Values to reflect that the house is old in the "context of European occupation of Mount Victoria" rather than the "context of human occupation".	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.1	Amend	Considers that changes should be made that actively support, and definitely don't undermine, the better places created by more density done well and proximity to daily amenities.	Seeks changes to the Council's Network Operating Framework, Parking Policies, street maintenance systems.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.2	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Seeks greater resourcing of Council's planning and consent enforcing teams over road maintenance.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.3	Support	Considers that greater resourcing is needed to implement the plan.	Supports more rates being used for resourcing these teams vs for maintaining large sections of road seal to a high standard for driving and parking private vehicles.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	<p>Seeks that combined / pooled resources for consenting, design review, and other permitting functions are established that mean multiple small councils can enjoy high-calibre people and economies of scale.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Christina Mackay	478.1	Support	<p>Submitter supports Historic Places Wellington's submissions.</p> <p>Supports the submission by Historic Places Wellington including support for PDP proposals for heritage provisions, proposals for additional heritage listings, new Historical and Cultural Heritage provisions and for inner city heritage/character suburbs.</p>	Supports Historic Places Wellington's submission. [Refer to submission 182]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Ben Barrett	479.1	Not specified	<p>Supports the Isthmus group planning ideas https://isthmus.co.nz/thinking/density-donewell-10-tips-for-aotearoa/ If any of these ideas can be included in the DP that would be useful.</p> <p>Submitter wants to see more evidence of wider expert planning consideration from professional groups such as Isthmus.</p>	Supports the Isthmus group planning ideas	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Ben Barrett	479.2	Amend	[Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council has a dedicated customer team to support those that are leading the way in development and make it easier	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA

					for them to get consent.						
Other / Other / Other	Ben Barrett	479.3	Amend	Considers that the Council should increase the percentage of green spaces in line with planned population density . [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council will increase the percentage of green spaces in line with planned population density.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Ben Barrett	479.4	Amend	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).	Seeks that the Council improve the quality of green spaces.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Ben Barrett	479.5	Amend	Considers that Newtown streets have far too many cars on already. Private (internal combustion) vehicle priorities need to be secondary to active travel, and public transport.	Seeks that the Council will limit private car use and parking.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Catharine Underwood	481.12	Amend	Considers that the 'We Are Newtown housing/dwelling plan/proposal by the residents for the residents' should be recognised by Councillors and be considered as the blue print for Newtown. Council officers have rejected the residents' plan as it was different to the residents wants. Though it achieved exactly the same outcome regarding the number of dwellings.	Seek that the 'We Are Newtown housing/dwelling plan/proposal by the residents for the residents' be recognised and considered as the proposed district plan provisions for Newtown.	Stream 2 point		36.242	Oppose	Considers that this matter goes beyond the scope of the District Plan controls	Disallow
Other / Other / Other	Catharine Underwood	481.13	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.	Stream 7 point		5.1	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
Other / Other / Other	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.2	Not specified	Considers that there are too many shortcuts where the edges often have no obvious exits (because of high and solid property boundaries) and there is no surveillance.	Seeks that shortcuts have obvious exits and do not have high and solid property boundaries. [Inferred decision requested].	Stream 2 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.3	Not specified	Considers that there are often excessive numbers or width of vehicle accessways across footpaths, and footpaths are often modified to suit driveway use rather than footpath users	Not specified.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.4	Amend	Considers that during construction, it tends to be the footpath that is lost.	Seeks that the WCC ensures that effective pedestrian provision is maintained through the construction stage, including for those with wheelchairs, suitcases etc. [Inferred decision requested].	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.5	Not specified	Considers that the pedestrian network is disconnected at every intersection. Roundabouts are a particular problem. Crossings often put where that minimises effects on traffic rather than to ensure a direct pedestrian route. Crossing systems are not designed to make the pedestrian journey seamless eg. they may require the pedestrian to wait twice, as at the Basin Reserve crossing in Kent/Cambridge.	Not specified.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

Other / Other / Other	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.6	Amend	Considers that parts of the pedestrian grid are missing. Sometimes this is because of topography, sometimes because of poor past decisions during subdivisions, sometimes because it has been subsequently lost. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that the complete pedestrian grid is restored and enhanced at every opportunity. [inferred decision requested]	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.7	Amend	Considers that the District Plan needs to be clear that public access is a far higher priority than privacy. Public accessways are not always visible or signposted and there is sometimes pressure from adjacent landowners to not have them visible to the public.	Seeks that the public accessways are visible or signposted. [Inferred decision requested].	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.8	Amend	Considers that there have been a number of cases where private property owners have requested driveways along what are currently pedestrian only shortcuts. This significantly reduces pedestrian service levels and amenity of the space.	Seeks that the District Plan ensures that private vehicle use on pedestrian accessways is avoided.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.9	Not specified	Considers that the city suffers from poor quality public spaces in terms of lighting, surface, seats, shelter and shade, wayfinding. It is important that the overall public space delivers amenity, rather than there just being reliance on a few spaces that get focused design work.	Seeks that every available public space is treated as valuable and made usable.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.10	Amend	Considers that many public spaces are cluttered by poles, signs, café tables, bike parking infrastructure and so on. It is vital that the DP ensures an adequate uncluttered width of footpath, rather than treating an unusable part of the footpath as contributing to provision.	Seeks that the District Plan ensures that an adequate uncluttered width of footpath is provided and that new infrastructure should not be located in footpath space.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.11	Not specified	Considers that there are significant accessibility issues in Wellington, including to buildings and public spaces.	Not specified.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.12	Not specified	Considers that walking routes also need to be public spaces. Considers that this is essential to ensure that access is assured in future and walkability can be enhanced by the council and supported by community groups.	Not specified.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.13	Not specified	Considers that an important health measure to combat the spread of COVID-19 and other future diseases will be to increase the utility of well-ventilated outdoor space. In cities and towns overseas where this has been handled well, this involved widened footpaths, temporary cycle lanes, and an increase in outdoor dining options, to allow for adequate social distancing.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.14	Amend	Much of our public space between buildings is wasted – cultivating only parked cars, weeds, and litter. Many of our streets are wider than needed for vehicle movement purposes, and space could easily be re-allocated to public amenity and walking.	Seeks that street space is re-allocated to public amenity and walking. [Inferred decision requested].	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.15	Amend	Considers that the widening of footpaths is vital to handle the likely increased pedestrian	Seeks that planning prioritises the widening of footpaths. In the	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA

				numbers, use of micro-mobility devices, social distancing, and as meeting and socialising spaces.	short-term, tactical urbanism can be used to create more walking space until the budget allows for a proper footpath is created.						
Other / Other / Other	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.16	Amend	Considers that the widening of footpaths is vital to handle the likely increased pedestrian numbers, use of micro-mobility devices, social distancing, and as meeting and socialising spaces. Much of our public space between buildings is wasted – cultivating only parked cars, weeds, and litter. Many of our streets are wider than needed for vehicle movement purposes, and space could easily be re-allocated to public amenity and walking.	Seeks that the formed footpath space available is increased through the removal of footpath clutter, a well-signalled tougher line on footpath parking, and utilisation of roadside parking for outdoors seating.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.17	Amend	Considers that non-disability parking should be re-purposed for outdoor seating to achieve the triple benefit of increasing capacity for businesses, highlighting to businesses in practice that short-term car parking is not essential for business success, and maintaining the footpath space required for pedestrians and other footpath users.	Seeks that non-disability parking is re-purposed for outdoor seating.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.18	Not specified	Considers that work needs to be to increase parking availability while reducing parking footprint. The Thorndon Quay argument epitomises the tendency for businesses to conflate parking places with parking availability.	Seeks that work is done to allow booked parking for some key purposes, changing long-term spaces to more short-term and drop off/pickup spaces, and moving non-customer parking to other places. [Inferred decision requested].	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.19	Oppose	Opposes allowing individual developers to impose their vision on the community.	Not specified.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Hilary Carr	483.1	Amend	Considers that to encourage more people to use public transport, more park and ride facilities are required in the suburbs, and a fairly large one on the waterfront by the railway station.	Seeks that more park and ride facilities are required in the suburbs, and a fairly large one on the waterfront by the railway station (charged during the week, free in weekends). [Refer to original submission for full detail].	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Hilary Carr	483.2	Support	Considers that to encourage more people to use public transport, maybe have buses running 24/7 continually or until 3-5am from Courtney Place to the Railway station at least Thursday to Saturday hop on hop off for a minimal or no charge.	Seeks that there are buses running 24/7 continually or until 3-5am from Courtney Place to the Railway station at least Thursday to Saturday hop on hop off for a minimal or no charge.	Stream 9 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Hilary Carr	483.3	Support	Considers that providing each property with a food waste bin, services for collection, and a worm farm landfill would reduce methane and provide user friendly manure.	Seeks that each property is provided with a food waste bin, and services provided for collection and a worm farm landfill.	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.1	Amend	Considers that there are limited provisions for papakainga in the plan and this is not adequate for iwi.	Amend the plan to include a papakainga chapter to be developed in partnership with mana whenua.	Accept in part	No	89.42	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the introduction of a standalone papakainga chapter.	Allow

Appendix B - General Point - Other

Other / Other / Other	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.2	Not specified	Considers that throughout the plan the language used to refer to the role of mana whenua in resource management switches between 'active involvement,' 'active participation,' and 'active partnership.'	Seeks that the role of mana whenua is consistently referred to as active partnership. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.3	Amend	Considers that cultural wellbeing could be better supported in the plan as CEKP-05 is the only place this is mentioned.	Amend the plan to give effect to cultural wellbeing across the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Craig Palmer	492.1	Not specified	Considers that more inner city parks and green space are needed in the CCZ.	Seeks that more inner city paks and green spaces are created in the City Centre.	Stream 7 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	Rita Angus Cottage Trust (formerly Thorndon Trust)	494.1	Amend	Considers that the Historic Heritage Area Evaluation report December 2021 on the Ascot Street Heritage Area should be amended to correct two mistakes regarding Cooper's Cottage.	Seeks that Cooper's Cottage should be HNZPT Category 2 listed in both the <i>Acknowledgements</i> , page 2, and the <i>List of Places</i> , pages 21-36 (not Category 1). In the <i>Inventory of buildings and features</i> table, pages 275-8, Cooper's Cottage should be status 4 (not status 3).	Stream 3 point		NA	NA	NA	NA
Other / Other / Other	John Mulholland	497.1	Support	Supports Smith Geursen's submission regarding the alteration of SNA boundaries in Carey Gully.	Supports Smith Geursen's submission. [Refer to submission 475]	Wrap up point		NA	NA	NA	NA

Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers' rec For reasons see body of report	Change to PDP?	Further Sub No / Point No	Position	Reasons for Support or Opposition	Decisions Requested
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Simon Ross	37.2	Amend	Considers that the definition of walkable catchments and low walking speeds are restrictive and inappropriate around the city centre, train, and other mass transit stations.	Seeks that walkable catchments are extended to be 1200m or 15 minutes walking distance (whichever is greater) in locations around the city centre, train, and other mass transit stations.	Accept in part – extend some catchments to 5, 10 and 15 minutes – see report	Yes	131.49	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								136.77	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around 	Allow

										<p>city centres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
								137.41	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Simon Ross	37.3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that NPS-UD provisions along the probable Lets Get Wellington Moving mass transit routes are applied.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Stephen Pause	64.1	Amend	Supports the designation of the Johnsonville Line (JVL) as rapid transit for the following reasons: The JVL is capable of providing high-capacity, reliable, and quick service directly to the CBD from four major suburbs. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]. The argument that a rapid transit service is not provided due to the current lack of development along the JVL is circular because higher density development and greater commercial activity is not currently encouraged/allowed.	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line is classified as rapid transit as per the NPS-UD Policy 3.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Stephen Pause	64.2	Amend	Considers that the removal of the JVL as rapid transit removes the requirements for walking catchments along the JVL (except Johnsonville station) and the possibilities for six-storey development (except at Johnsonville station). Not designating the JVL as rapid transit does not appear to meet National Policy Statement - Urban Development (NPS-UD) Policy 3. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line is classified as rapid transit as per the NPS-UD Policy 3.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Generation Zero Inc	254.10	Amend	Considers that a 10-minute walkable catchment is inconsistent with the policy direction of the NPS-UD and the approach of other Tier 1 local authorities and not supported by a robust section 32 assessment, rather decisions by Councillors which the submitter does not agree with.	Seeks that the area of the walkable catchment around the edge of the Metropolitan centre zone where 6 storey development must be enabled be increased to 15 minutes.	Reject	No	3.20	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
								62.22	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
								82.35	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								89.71	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission to the extent that this aligns with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow
								96.69	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National	Generation Zero Inc	254.11	Amend	Considers that a 10-minute walkable catchment is inconsistent with the policy direction of the NPS-UD and the approach of other Tier 1 local	Seeks that the area of the walkable catchment around existing and planned rapid transit stop where 6 storey development	Accept in part – some increase to 10 minutes recommended –	Yes	3.21	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make	Disallow

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General				authorities and not supported by a robust section 32 assessment, rather decisions by Councillors which the submitter does not agree with.	must be enabled be increased to 15 minutes.	see report			walking difficult for residents.		
				62.23	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow				
				82.36	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow				
				89.72	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission to the extent that this aligns with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow				
				96.70	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow				
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Generation Zero Inc	254.12	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line meets the definition and criteria of rapid transit in the NPS-UD.	Seeks that Johnsonville Rail Line is designated a rapid transit service in the Proposed District Plan and the stops along it as rapid transit stops.	Accept	Yes	80.42	Oppose	Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line does not meet the National Policy Statement on Urban Development definition of a rapid transit service.	Disallow
				89.73				Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission to the extent that this aligns with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow	
				114.8				Oppose	The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services. Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi. In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service. Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public	Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).	
				Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line is underused and has spare capacity. Considers that the Greater Wellington Regional Council identification of the Johnsonville line as rapid transit in the RLTP 2021 as the best available source of information for the matter. Considers that failure to identify Johnsonville Rail Line as rapid transit will make the Proposed District Plan inconsistent with the requirements of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD. Considers that identifying the Johnsonville rail line as a rapid transit service and intensifying around it will support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Considers that MfE guidance references Wellington’s commuter rail services as an example of existing rapid transit stops as supporting Johnsonville Rail Line to be designated a rapid transit service. [Refer to original submission for full reason]							

										transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]			
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Generation Zero Inc	254.13	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line meets the definition and criteria of rapid transit in the NPS-UD.	Seeks that High Density Residential Zone is applied to all residential sites within a 15-minute walkable catchment of the rapid transit stops on the Johnsonville Rail line except where a justifiable qualifying matter applies.	Accept in part – some five and ten minute catchments recommended – see report	Yes	80.43	Oppose	Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line does not meet the National Policy Statement on Urban Development definition of a rapid transit service	Disallow		
										89.74	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission to the extent that this aligns with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow
										114.9	Oppose	The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services. Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi. In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service. Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also	Disallow Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).

										invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.19	Support	Generally supports these provisions as drafted.	Retain "National Direction Instruments" section as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.19	Amend	Considers that given the increased building height and reduced height to boundary controls enabled under the MDRS which increase the risk of potential interference with the rail corridor from maintenance and other activities being undertaken on sites adjoining the rail corridor, KiwiRail considers 5m is an appropriate distance for setbacks	Seeks that the rail corridor be identified as a qualifying matter to incorporate provisions which are necessary for the safe and efficient operation of the rail corridor. Specifically, this qualifying matter needs to be applied in the Proposed Plan to require a "no-build" setback within 5m of the railway corridor for new buildings or structures in all relevant zones adjacent to the railway.	Reject	No	80.45	Support	Supports the rail corridor being identified as a qualifying matter to incorporate provisions which are necessary for the safe and efficient operation of the rail corridor. Considers that, specifically, this qualifying matter needs to be applied in the Proposed Plan to require a "no-build" setback within 5m of the railway corridor for new buildings or structures in all relevant zones adjacent to the railway.	Allow
									Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the inclusion of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter. Kāinga Ora also opposes all consequential changes to other provisions and rules relating to the rail corridor as a qualifying matter (in particular 408.116 & 408.120).	Disallow
									Oppose	Stride is opposed to identifying a setback area within 5m of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter. This is not necessary for the safe or efficient operation of the railway line, which is already provided for through KiwiRail's designation. Imposing an additional setback as proposed would inappropriately constrain development outside of the rail designation, and inappropriately externalises the costs of the infrastructure on to private landowners. We note that KiwiRail is a Requiring Authority so has the ability to designate private land in order to acquire the interests required for their operations if the existing designation is insufficient.	Disallow
									Oppose	Investore is opposed to identifying a setback area within 5m of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter. This is not necessary for the safe or efficient operation of the railway line, which is already provided for through KiwiRail's designation. Imposing an additional setback as proposed would inappropriately constrain development outside of the rail designation, and inappropriately externalises the costs of the infrastructure on to private landowners. We note that KiwiRail is a Requiring Authority so has the ability to designate private land in order to acquire the interests required for their operations if the existing designation is insufficient.	Disallow

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.10	Not specified	Considers that the RMA Schedule 3B requirements for maximising development are incompatible with some of the strategic objectives of the PDP as expressed in the section on Urban Form and Development RMA Schedule 3A Clause 6. [See original submission for full reasons]	Not specified.	Reject	No	111.57	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Direction Instruments General	Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.15	Amend	Considers that the NPS-UD is divorced from actual need because it requires councils to deliver a great deal of new development capacity all at once above the amount required at the time. This includes raising height limits irrespective of need. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Council applying an integrated set of qualifying matters that act together to hold height limits at a level the community seeks in the inner suburbs and review as additional capacity is shown to be required.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Jack Chu	4.1	Support	Rapid transit routes are fully capable of supporting growth.	Not specified.	Accept in part – more and increased walkable catchments around rapid transit stops – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Jack Chu	4.2	Amend	Rapid transit routes are fully capable of supporting growth.	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as a Mass Rapid Transit Line. [Inferred from submission]	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Jack Chu	4.3	Amend	Town centre areas e.g. Johnsonville are perfectly suited to allow for high density allocation.	Amend walkable catchment areas to 15 minutes.	Reject	No	3.28	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
								62.30	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow

	Gareth Morgan	18.1	Support	Hay Street is a river gully and building further resilient drainage is difficult. Hay Street has poor vehicle access. Increasing height limits on Hay Street would negatively impact the character of the area and the streetscape.	Retain MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) as notified - with 11m height limit. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject – Hay street is partly within recommended 15 minute CCZ walkable catchment - see report	Yes	136.82	Oppose	The submitters reasons are not justifiable as the unstable geography is determined by a geotechnical analysis of a s88 RMA Report. This would ensure that any future development would not be adversely impacted by unstable geography. The road navigation and suitability for turning bays are addressed through a Traffic Assessment as part of a s88 RMA Report. An increase in density on Hay Street would not adversely effect road navigation and vehicular access. Lastly, Wellington City Council has determined the Heritage Precincts with regards to Qualifying Matters. As noted in the Proposed District Plan s32 Evaluation report Part 2: Character Precincts and the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct at s6, there exists a process for determining character precincts relative to a series of key criteria. Oriental Bay & Hay Street are not recognised as having a Character Area Qualifying Matter apply. MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) is an appropriate precinct for recognising the aspects that have been tested before the courts. Any expansion to this precinct fails to give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Gareth Morgan	18.2	Support	<p>Extending Walkable catchments further than 10 minutes may lead to more densification, forcing more people to walk in rough Wellington conditions.</p> <p>Lack of private transport in the city makes it less liveable. If further densification leads to more public transport and less private, it will lead to a less liveable city.</p> <p>10 minute walkable catchment is less damaging than a 15 minute definition because the process to define walkable catchment was poor.</p> <p>10 minutes limits densification to areas better suited for it.</p>	Retain Walkable Catchments (at 10 minutes) as notified.	Reject – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ	Yes	130.10	Support	Living Streets Aotearoa support retention of existing walk catchment and amend to a 10 minute catchment.	Allow
								131.15	Oppose	<p>Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delievers with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow

								136.42	Oppose	<p>The submitters request to keep the walkable catchment at 10 minutes is opposed for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is unreasonable for the original submitter to assume that a walking catchment of 15 minutes would exclude elderly residents from utilising other transport options. - The submitter opposes that a greater walking catchment does not take into account the effects of terrain on walking time - the effects of slope and walking speed were used in the creation of walking catchments. - The submitter opposes that the greater walking catchment does not reflect the willingness to walk based on weather conditions. - The Spatial Plan adopted on 21 June 2021 used a 15-min walking catchment which was seen as a step in the right direction by housing advocates. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow
								137.32	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction	Joanne Morgan	19.2	Support	Wellington can be challenging to navigate by foot or bike due to its incremental weather. Except for good days, private vehicle transport is a must. The wind (specifically around the corner of Hay	Retain Walkable Catchments (at 10 minutes) as notified.	Reject - recommend 15 minutes from CCZ	Yes	131.18	Oppose	<p>Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is 	Disallow

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement				St and Oriental Parade) can make walking dangerous especially for older people.						<p>becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delivered with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
								136.45	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Simon Ross	37.4	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as rapid transit and as such apply full NPS-UD provisions.	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line be classified as a mass rapid transit line.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Simon Ross	37.5	Amend	Considers that the current zoning disregards the NPS-UD direction. The Johnsonville Line should be classified as rapid transit and as such it should apply full NPS-UD zoning (six-storey).	Rezone the Johnsonville line from MRZ to HRZ. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Lilias Bell	50.1	Support	Supports the Johnsonville Line not being classified as rapid transit under the NPS-UD.	Retain Johnsonville Line as not being classified as rapid transit.	Reject	Yes	114.5	Support	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Allow</p> <p>Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).</p>

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Noelle Pause	55.1	Amend	<p>Opposes that the classification of the Johnsonville Line (JVL) is not rapid transit for the following reasons:</p> <p>The JVL is capable of providing high-capacity, reliable, and quick service directly to the CBD from four major suburbs. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p> <p>The removal of JVL as rapid transit will limit future development of much-needed higher density housing and commercial services that could be frequented by the four suburbs combined 27,000+ residents (2018 census).</p> <p>The argument that a rapid transit service is not provided due to the current lack of development along the JVL is circular because higher density development and greater commercial activity is not currently encouraged/allowed.</p> <p>Not encouraging multi-family development will only drive up house prices while the quality of aging homes declines.</p>	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line is classified as a Mass Rapid Transit Line as per the NPS-UD Policy 3.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Noelle Pause	55.2	Amend	<p>Considers that the removal of the JVL as rapid transit removes the requirements for walking catchments along the JVL (except Johnsonville station) and the possibilities for six-storey development (except at Johnsonville station).</p> <p>Not designating the JVL as rapid transit does not appear to meet National Policy Statement - Urban Development (NPS-UD) Policy 3.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line is classified as a Mass Rapid Transit Line as per the NPS-UD Policy 3.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Noelle Pause	55.3	Not specified	<p>Considers that single-family homes should not be expected or promoted within a 5- minute walking catchment of a frequent and reliable rail service that brings residents directly to the country's capital within 10-25 minutes.</p>	Not specified.	Accept in part, see body of report where five minute catchments are recommended for HDRZ	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Coronation Real Estate Ltd	62.2	Support	Considers that zoning the site at 9 Comber Place as MRZ aligns with the NPS-UD as it provides for residential use and enables additional housing supply.	Rezone 9 Comber Place from Natural Open Space Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Addressed in Stream 7		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Conor Hill	76.5	Not specified	Considers that the Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically Objective 2 as there is not enough land rezoned to create a competitive land market.	Seeks that there is far more greenfield development as part of the District Plan.	Addressed in stream 6		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Conor Hill	76.6	Not specified	Considers that the Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, Policy 1(a)(i) because the plan will not bring housing prices down to \$300k.	[Not specified]	Reject		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Conor Hill	76.7	Not specified	Considers that the Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, Policy 1(b) because the PDP does not provide enough commercial zoning in most suburbs.	Seeks that at least one quarter of Wellington evenly spread should have ground floor zoned commercially.	Addressed in stream 4		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Conor Hill	76.8	Not specified	Considers that the Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, Policy 2 as not enough land is zoned to provide for sufficient development capacity for housing and business.	[Not specified]	Reject	no	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Conor Hill	76.9	Not specified	Considers that the Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, Policy 3a as the provisions for the City Centre Zones will not achieve the requirement to provide as much development potential as necessary.	Seeks that height limits are removed in the City Centre Zone.	Addressed in stream 4		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Conor Hill	76.10	Amend	Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically Policy 3(c)(i) by not zoning 6 stories around the Johnsonville Line.	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line is included as a Mass Transit Line	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Conor Hill	76.11	Amend	Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically Policy 3(c)(i) by not planning to zone 6 stories along the two planned rapid transit lines East and South.	Seeks that planned East and South Mass Transit Lines are added.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Conor Hill	76.12	Amend	Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically Policy 3(c)(i) as the walkable catchments around the Kapiti Line are inconsistent.	Amend walkable catchment areas around planned rapid transit stops to the East and South to 20 minutes.	Reject	No	3.8	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
								62.10	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
								82.28	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								96.62	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Conor Hill	76.13	Amend	<p>Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically policy 3(c)(ii) because the PDP has walkable catchments wrong.</p> <p>Considers that most Wellingtonians who walk to work walk further than 20 minutes. Notes that their daughter's school is zoned more than 20 minutes away.</p>	<p>Seeks that walkable catchment from the edge of the CCZ (City Centre Zone) is extended to 20 minutes and that development of at least 6 storeys is enabled in this catchment.</p>	<p>Accept in part – recommend extension to 15 minutes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	3.9	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
								62.11	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
								82.29	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								96.63	Oppose	<p>We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, ViLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group.</p> <p>10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.</p>	Disallow
								130.3	Oppose	<p>Walk catchments at 15 minutes are already in excess of that required. A walk catchment of 10 minutes is sufficient and is more equitable to the broad and varied range of people with different needs and abilities in a community. Walk catchments are intended as a planning tool for access to specific destinations such as a public transport stop. They are not intended as a general tool to an 'inner city' zone which may not have any of the everyday services needed, for instance access to a fresh food outlet. 10 minutes walk at an average speed is slightly less than one kilometre for a fit healthy adult. It does not encompass all the community and says nothing about the amenity, service levels or attractiveness of the walk environment. Research shows that a best practice environment (such as following all the requirements in the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide/ Pedestrian Network Guidance) makes it easier for most people to walk further. A walkable catchment does not of itself provide this. Other provision to ensure this best practice must be embedded in the PDP.</p>	<p>Disallow</p> <p>Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to a more equitable 10 minutes.</p>
131.34	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; 	Allow								

									<p>higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
							136.14	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
							136.62	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. 	Allow

									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
							137.19	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Conor Hill	76.14	Amend	Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically policy 3(c)(iii) (Metropolitan Centre Zone walkable catchments) and the walkable catchment here should be 20 minutes.	Seeks that walkable catchment extended to 20 minutes from the edge of Kilbirnie and that development of at least 6 storeys is enabled in this catchment.	Accept in part – recommend extension 10 minutes from Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this)	Yes	3.10	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
								62.12	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
								82.30	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								96.64	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, ViLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Conor Hill	76.15	Amend	Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically policy 3(c)(iii) (Metropolitan Centre Zone walkable catchments) and the walkable catchment here should be 20 minutes.	Seeks that walkable catchment extended to 20 minutes from the edge of Johnsonville and that development of at least 6 storeys is enabled in this catchment.	Reject	No	3.11	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
								82.31	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								62.13	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
								96.65	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, ViLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Conor Hill	76.16	Amend	Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically policy 3(c)(iii) (Metropolitan Centre Zone walkable catchments) and the walkable catchment here should be 20 minutes.	Seeks that walkable catchment extended to 20 minutes from the edge of Tawa and that development of at least 6 storeys is enabled in this catchment.	Reject	No	3.12	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
								62.14	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow

Zealand Coastal Policy Statement								82.32	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								96.66	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, ViLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Conor Hill	76.17	Amend	Considers that Council isn’t meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically policy 3(c)(iii) (Metropolitan Centre Zone walkable catchments) and the walkable catchment here should be 20 minutes.	Seeks that walkable catchment extended to 20 minutes from the edge of Newtown and that development of at least 6 storeys is enabled in this catchment.	Reject	No	3.13	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
								62.15	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
								82.33	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								96.67	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, ViLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Conor Hill	76.18	Oppose	Considers that the PDP has walkable catchments wrong. Considers that most Wellingtonians who walk to work walk further than 20 minutes. Notes that their daughter’s school is zoned more than 20 minutes away.	Seeks that all walkable catchments are extended to 20 minutes.	Accept in part – some catchments recommend extension – see report	Yes	3.14	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
								62.16	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
								82.34	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								96.68	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, ViLabour,	Disallow

									Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.		
								130.4	Oppose	Walk catchments at 15 minutes are already in excess of that required. A walk catchment of 10 minutes is sufficient and is more equitable to the broad and varied range of people with different needs and abilities in a community. Walk catchments are intended as a planning tool for access to specific destinations such as a public transport stop. They are not intended as a general tool to an ‘inner city’ zone which may not have any of the everyday services needed, for instance access to a fresh food outlet. 10 minutes walk at an average speed is slightly less than one kilometre for a fit healthy adult. It does not encompass all the community and says nothing about the amenity, service levels or attractiveness of the walk environment. Research shows that a best practice environment (such as following all the requirements in the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide/ Pedestrian Network Guidance) makes it easier for most people to walk further. A walkable catchment does not of itself provide this. Other provision to ensure this best practice must be embedded in the PDP.	Disallow Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to a more equitable 10 minutes.
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Conor Hill	76.19	Amend	Considers that Council isn’t meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically policy 3(d) has been ignored.	Seeks that walkable catchments extended to 10 minutes from local and town centres.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Conor Hill	76.20	Amend	Considers that Council isn’t meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically policy 3(d) has been ignored.	Seeks that local and town centres should be allowed development of 6 storeys, or if not, then the proposed District Plan should allow an unlimited number of homes per section in those places.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Conor Hill	76.21	Amend	Considers that Wadestown as an example has reasonable infrastructure to be zoned with more mixed use to meet the requirements of policy 3(d) of the NPS-UD.	Seeks that Wadestown should be zoned for development of 6 storeys and have more provisions that enable more mixed use activities.	Addressed in Stream 2		NA	NA	NA	NA

Zealand Coastal Policy Statement											
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Conor Hill	76.22	Not specified	Considers that Council isn't meeting their obligations under the NPS-UD, specifically Part 3.2(1)(a), as there has been very little new land zoned as required.	[Not specified].	Addressed in stream 6		NA	NA	NA	NA
Considers that Wellington weather conditions limit walkability and 10 minutes is appropriate.	Ann Mallinson	81.2	Support		Retain Walkable Catchments around the City Centre Zone (CCZ) as notified (at 10 minutes).	Reject – recommend extension to 15 minutes	Yes	131.33	Oppose	Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons: - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delievers with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
								136.61	Oppose	The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons: - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained	Disallow

										<p>meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
								137.18	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	David Stephen	82.2	Support	Supports Johnsonville Line not being classified as a Mass Rapid Transit line.	Retain Johnsonville Line as not being classified as rapid transit.	Reject	Yes	114.10	Support	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be "frequent" and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p>	<p>Disallow</p> <p>Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).</p>

										Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	David Stephen	82.3	Amend	Considers that 3-waters infrastructure is a qualifying matter under NPS-UD subpart 6, clause 3.32.	Seeks that 3-waters infrastructure is interpreted as a qualifying matter under the NPS-UD subpart 6, clause 3.32.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Hugh Good	90.1	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as rapid transit.	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as a Mass Rapid Transit Line.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Ian Law	101.2	Support	Supports Johnsonville Line not being classified as rapid transit.	Retain Johnsonville Line as not being classified as rapid transit.	Reject	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal	Ian Law	101.3	Amend	Considers that 3-waters infrastructure is a qualifying matter under NPS-UD subpart 6, clause 3.32.	Seeks that 3-waters infrastructure is interpreted as a qualifying matter under the NPS-UD subpart 6, clause 3.32.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Policy Statement											
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Julie Patricia Ward	103.3	Support	Supports Johnsonville Line not being classified as rapid transit. Considers that is not a quick, frequent, reliable and high-capacity public transport service to which the NPS-UD applies.	Retain Johnsonville Line as not being classified as rapid transit (as notified).	Reject	Yes	114.11	Support	The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services. Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi. In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service. Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Disallow Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	292 Main Road Limited	105.2	Amend	Considers that the WCC definition of walking speed at 4.86km/hr is slow and determined by a small sample size. Waka Kotahi has a much larger amount of data and their walking speeds should be respected.	Seeks that the PDP interpretation of Policy 3 of the UPS-UD (Walkable Catchments) assumes a 4.8km/hr to 5km/hr as recommended by Waka Kotahi.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments /	Oliver Sangster	112.7	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville trainline is a good commuter route into the city and this will give young people an opportunity to purchase new, smaller homes within rail commute distance from the city	Amend the plan to enable higher density development around train stations along the Johnsonville Rail Line regardless of whether or not the rail line technically/legally	Accept in part. If JVL is not a rapid transit service, recommend	Yes	82.23	Oppose	Considers submissions are inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements; and no justification for enabling more intensive development in the MDRZ or around rail stations. [inferred reference to submission 112.7]	Disallow

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement					meets the NPS-UD definition of “rapid transit service”.	higher density in a segment near Box Hill Rail Station. See report.					
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Pam Wilson	120.2	Support	Supports the Johnsonville Line no longer being classified as a Rapid Transit System.	Retain the Johnsonville Line classification as notified (not Rapid Transit).	Reject	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Pam Wilson	120.3	Amend	Considers that 3-waters infrastructure should be qualifying matter that governs where development takes place.	Seeks that 3-waters infrastructure is interpreted as a qualifying matter under the NPS-UD. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga – Ministry of Housing and Urban Development	121.1	Amend	Considers that the smaller 10 minute walkable catchment from the city centre from the draft District Plan would have no benefits and shift development to less well suited areas	Amend the high density zoning and around the city centre to cover at least the area within a 15 minute walkable catchment (rather than the current 10 minute catchment)	Accept	Yes	96.76	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga – Ministry of Housing and Urban Development	121.3	Oppose	Considers that the PDP does not adequately provide for housing supply as required by the NPS-UD, specifically due to the constraints imposed by 1. The character precinct provisions 2. The reduction in the size of the walkable catchment from the CCZ, from 15 minutes in the Draft District Plan to 10 minutes in the PDP 3. The absence of the identification of the Johnsonville train line as a mass rapid transit line.	Not specified.	Accept in part, see body of report.	Yes	80.37	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Disallow Seeks to disallow in so far as the submission point relates to the classification of the Johnsonville Rail Line as a rapid transit service.
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga – Ministry of Housing and Urban Development	121.4	Amend	Considers that failing to identify the Johnsonville train line as a mass rapid transit in the PDP is contrary to other planning documents and would have significant negative impacts with respect to provision of housing.	Seeks to identify the Johnsonville train line as rapid transit and adjust the zoning around the relevant stops accordingly.	Accept	Yes	114.2	Oppose	The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services. Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the	Disallow Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).

Zealand Coastal Policy Statement										Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.	
										In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.	
										Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
80.38	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Disallow	Seeks to disallow in so far as the submission point relates to the classification of the Johnsonville Rail Line as a rapid transit service.							
84.125	Support	Greater Wellington consider Johnsonville Rail Line should be classified a rapid transit service to align with the RLTP which support the 'up-zoning' of walkable catchments. Johnsonville Rail Line is recognised as a key part of the region's transport network.	Allow	Seeks review of walkable catchments and reclassification of Johnsonville Rail Line as a rapid transit service.							
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oriental Bay Residents Association Inc	128.1	Support	Supports the adoption of 10 minutes (800) for the CBD "walkable catchment" under NPS-UD Policy 3. Considers that it would be unreasonable to expect Oriental Bay residents, many of whom are elderly, to walk more than 10 minutes to services. Exposure to extreme winds and sea conditions along the only practicable route (Oriental Parade), without shelter, means	Retain 10 minute walkable catchment as notified. Or, reduce it to 5 minutes (400m).	Reject – recommend extending to 15 minutes	Yes	131.24	Oppose	Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons: - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delivers with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where	Disallow

				walking is frequently not practicable for many residents, nor is cycling or use of e-scooters.					people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].		
								136.52	Oppose	The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow
								137.4	Oppose	Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.	Disallo

										WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.4	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	131.4	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.5	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – recommendations for 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.6	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Anne Lian	132.3	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	131.7	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
								137.33	Support	Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation. WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Allow

								136.26	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								136.34	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. 	Allow

										- The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Anne Lian	132.4	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – recommend 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Anne Lian	132.5	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Ingo Schommer	133.4	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	3.26	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
								62.28	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
								131.6	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling	Allow

										Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Ingo Schommer	133.5	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – recommend 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	3.27	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
								62.29	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Ingo Schommer	133.6	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Olivier Reuland	134.4	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	131.17	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
								136.16	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in	Allow

									<p>Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
							136.44	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. 	Allow

										[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	
								137.5	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Olivier Reuland	134.5	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – recommend 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Olivier Reuland	134.6	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Ella Patterson	138.2	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are made larger and increased to 15 minutes. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – recommend 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Ella Patterson	138.3	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around Centres zones.	Seeks that walking catchments around Centres zones are made larger and increased to 15 minutes. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - recommended 15 minutes for CCZ, and 10 minutes for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this)	Yes	131.31	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
								136.15	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking	Allow

										<p>catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
								136.59	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								137.17	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs</p>	Allow

										where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation. WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Janice Young	140.4	Support	Supports the Johnsonville train line not being a rapid transit line.	Retain Johnsonville Line as not being classified as rapid transit.	Reject	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Grant Buchan	143.7	Amend	Considers that all inconsistencies between the NPS-UD and MDRS should be removed (in favour of NPS-UD directions).	Seeks that 15 minute walking catchments are applied to all mass transit stops.	Accept in part – recommend increase to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Grant Buchan	143.8	Amend	Considers that all inconsistencies between the NPS-UD and MDRS should be removed (in favour of NPS-UD directions).	Seeks that a 15 minute walking catchment is applied to the City Centre Zone.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Grant Buchan	143.9	Amend	Supports the Johnsonville Line being classified as rapid transit. Considers that the line has the capacity that clearly supports any reasonable definition of mass transit. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend Johnsonville Line to be classified as rapid transit (as per NPS-UD (National Policy Statement on Urban Development)).	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Grant Buchan	143.10	Amend	Considers that the NPS-UD dictates that qualifying matters should be applied on a site-by-site basis, not by broad areas.	Seeks that qualifying matters are applied on a site-by-site basis, not by broad areas. [Inferred decision requested].		No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Braydon White	146.5	Support	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	131.28	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
								136.25	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking	Allow

										<p>catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
								136.56	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								137.31	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs</p>	Allow

										where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation. WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Braydon White	146.6	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – recommend 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Braydon White	146.7	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Jennifer Mary Gyles	147.1	Support	Supports the adoption of 10 minutes (800) for the CBD "walkable catchment" under NPS-UD Policy 3. Considers that it would be unreasonable to expect Oriental Bay residents, many of whom are elderly, to walk more than 10 minutes to services. Exposure to extreme winds and sea conditions along the only practicable route (Oriental Parade), without shelter, means walking is frequently not practicable for many residents, nor is cycling or use of e-scooters.	Retain 10 minute walkable catchment as notified. Or, reduce it to 5 minutes (400m).	Reject – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ	Yes	130.11	Support	Living Streets Aotearoa support retention of existing walk catchment and amend to a 10 minute catchment.	Allow Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to more equitable 10 minutes.
								131.19	Oppose	Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons: - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delivered with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations.	Disallow

										[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	
								136.47	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. - The submitter stated that walking is not practical due to wind and sea conditions, also stating that it is unreasonable to expect elderly residents to walk more than 10 minutes to services. - the data does not support this which shows many people walk/cycle to the city centre. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow
								137.6	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs</p>	Disallow

										where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation. WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Matthew Gibbons	148.3	Amend	Considers there should be increased densification along the Johnsonville Railway Line. Considers, as an economist, that improved infrastructure (better railway lines and more frequent bus services) will follow intensification. Currently most of my students are paying almost all their income in rent, and this is not good for their health or education. Increased density will make Wellington a more attractive place to live and will be good for the economy.	Seeks that there is densification along the Johnsonville Railway Line.	Accept in part. If the Johnsonville Line is classified as rapid transit this would intensify certain areas along the Line, but I do not support "unrestricted intensification along the Johnsonville Railway Line." See body of report for explanation.	Yes	82.22	Oppose	Considers submissions are inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements; and no justification for enabling more intensive development in the MDRZ or around rail stations.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	David Stevens	151.6	Support	Supports Johnsonville Line (JVL) not being classified as rapid transit (RTS). Considers that the JVL cannot achieve better than four trains per hour, which does not meet the GWRC criteria for RTS of ten trains per hour. Together with limited bus service, this lack of frequency means that the Broadmeadows to Crofton Downs corridor is unsuitable for any substantial residential development without increasing carbon emissions. There is no planned major investment from GWRC or Kiwirail to double track this route.	Retain Johnsonville Line as not being classified as rapid transit.	Reject	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National	Cameron Vannisselroy	157.1	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased, in general, to 15-20 minutes.	Accept in part - recommended 15 minutes for	Yes	62.7	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow

Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement				The fact that some people are not willing to walk 15-20 minutes does not mean that others who are willing to should not receive the benefits of intensification.	[Inferred decision requested].	CCZ, and 10 minutes for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this)		82.25	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								96.59	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								130.1	Oppose	Walk catchments at 15 minutes are already in excess of that required. A walk catchment of 10 minutes is sufficient and is more equitable to the broad and varied range of people with different needs and abilities in a community. Walk catchments are intended as a planning tool for access to specific destinations such as a public transport stop. They are not intended as a general tool to an ‘inner city’ zone which may not have any of the everyday services needed, for instance access to a fresh food outlet. 10 minutes walk at an average speed is slightly less than one kilometre for a fit healthy adult. It does not encompass all the community and says nothing about the amenity, service levels or attractiveness of the walk environment. Research shows that a best practice environment (such as following all the requirements in the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide/ Pedestrian Network Guidance) makes it easier for most people to walk further. A walkable catchment does not of itself provide this. Other provision to ensure this best practice must be embedded in the PDP.	Disallow Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to a more equitable 10 minutes.
								131.32	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing	Allow

									liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].		
								136.7	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
								136.60	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments.	Allow

									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>		
								137.9	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy	Cameron Vannisselroy	157.2	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased, in general, to 15-20 minutes. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	62.8	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
								82.26	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow

Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement				intensification.				96.60	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								130.2	Oppose	Walk catchments at 15 minutes are already in excess of that required. A walk catchment of 10 minutes is sufficient and is more equitable to the broad and varied range of people with different needs and abilities in a community. Walk catchments are intended as a planning tool for access to specific destinations such as a public transport stop. They are not intended as a general tool to an ‘inner city’ zone which may not have any of the everyday services needed, for instance access to a fresh food outlet. 10 minutes walk at an average speed is slightly less than one kilometre for a fit healthy adult. It does not encompass all the community and says nothing about the amenity, service levels or attractiveness of the walk environment. Research shows that a best practice environment (such as following all the requirements in the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide/ Pedestrian Network Guidance) makes it easier for most people to walk further. A walkable catchment does not of itself provide this. Other provision to ensure this best practice must be embedded in the PDP.	Disallow Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to a more equitable 10 minutes.
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Cameron Vannisselroy	157.3	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject	No	3.7	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
								62.9	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
								82.27	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								96.61	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment	Disallow

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

										for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Cameron Vannisselroy	157.4	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as Rapid Transit.	Amend the Johnsonville Line to be classified as Rapid Transit and up zoned in accordance with the NPS-UD (National Policy Statement on Urban Development).	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	James and Karen Fairhall	160.2	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 “height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters”.	Not specified.	Addressed in Stream 2		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Karen and Jeremy Young	162.2	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 “height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters”.	Not specified.	Addressed in Stream 2		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Jill Ford	163.2	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Jill Ford	163.3	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around Centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around Centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	131.22	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce	Allow

									<p>reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>		
								136.6	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								136.50	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of 	Allow

									<p>residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>		
								137.12	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy	Tore Hayward	170.1	Support	<p>Supports the adoption of 10 minutes (800) for the CBD "walkable catchment" under NPS-UD Policy 3.</p> <p>Wind conditions have an important bearing on people's willingness to walk, and for how</p>	Retain 10 minute walkable catchment as notified.	Reject – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ	Yes	131.50	Oppose	<p>Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. 	Disallow

Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement			<p>long/far. Wellington averages 198 days per year with gale force winds, and 52 with storm force winds (based on a table from a NIWA publication). This reality supports a shorter walking time for Wellington than may be appropriate for some other cities.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons, including table].</p>						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delivered with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
						136.78	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. - There is evidence that people will walk/cycle in any weather, provided by the submitter. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow	
						137.42	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer</p>	Disallow	

										to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation. WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Scott Galloway & Carolyn McLean	171.1	Support	Supports the adoption of 10 minutes (800) for the CBD "walkable catchment" under NPS-UD Policy 3. Considers that it would be unreasonable to expect Oriental Bay residents, many of whom are elderly, to walk more than 10 minutes to services. Exposure to extreme winds and sea conditions along the only practicable route (Oriental Parade), without shelter, means walking is frequently not practicable for many residents, nor is cycling or use of e-scooters.	Retain 10 minute walkable catchment as notified. Or, reduce it to 5 minutes (400m).	Reject – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ	Yes	130.14	Support	Living Streets Aotearoa support retention of existing walk catchment and amend to a 10 minute catchment.	Allow Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to more equitable 10 minutes.
								131.29	Oppose	Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons: - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delivered with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow
								136.57	Oppose	The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons: - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density	Disallow

									<p>Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
								137.37	<p>Oppose</p> <p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason] [Inferred reference to 171.11]</p>	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New	Amos Mann	172.11	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	136.41	<p>Support</p> <p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new 	Allow

Zealand Coastal Policy Statement										<p>housing in Oriental Bay.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
							137.38	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow	

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amos Mann	172.12	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Amos Mann	172.13	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that MRZ height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Patrick Wilkes	173.5	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Patrick Wilkes	173.6	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Patrick Wilkes	173.7	Amend	Considers the declassification of the Johnsonville train line and change of decisions from the spatial plan as disappointing.	Seeks that the Johnsonville train line be classified as a 'rapid transit service' under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction	Patrick Wilkes	173.8	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject	No	82.20	Oppose	Considers submissions are inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements; and no justification for enabling more intensive development in the MDRZ or around rail stations.	Disallow

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement								96.57	Oppose	Luke Stewart, Matthew Reweti, Miriam Moore, Patrick Wilkes, Svend Hansen — seeks that MDRZ height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments around all rail stations. Opposed where this is inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.2	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Not specified.	Addressed in Stream 2		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Pete Gent	179.4	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	131.21	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
								136.18	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density	Allow

									<p>Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
							136.49	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
							137.21	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable</p>	Allow

										<p>catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Pete Gent	179.5	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Pete Gent	179.6	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Historic Places Wellington	182.7	Amend	Considers that a Qualifying Matter exists that should exempt areas within Policy 3 of the NPS-UD from upzoning. [See original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that areas subject to National Policy Statement Urban Development (NPSUD) Policy 3 "upzoning" a qualifying matter of "the aggregation of pre-1930s buildings embodies the historical and cultural values of historic, physical, social, rarity and representativeness and should have special procedural care before they are demolished." apply to exempt them from	Reject	No	69.102	Support	All inner Residential suburbs should be MDZ Exemption from upzoning Importance of character areas Character Precincts, rules & design regime Extended Character Precincts in line with Boffa Miskell Demolition be a restricted activity for pre-1930 buildings New viewshaft for views of St Paul's	Allow

					mandatory 6-storey plus intensification otherwise required.						
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Athena Papadopoulos	183.1	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Not specified.	Addressed in Stream 2		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Lara Bland	184.1	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Not specified.	Addressed in Stream 2		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Emma Baines	185.4	Support	Supports the Johnsonville train line not being classified as rapid transit under the NPS- UD. Considers that the total travel time, due to often arriving late or being delayed on track, highlights that it cannot be considered rapid transit.	Retain Johnsonville train line as notified (not classified as rapid transit).	Reject	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Geoff Palmer	188.1	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Not specified.	Addressed in Stream 2		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Peter Nunns	196.6	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	131.45	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more	Allow

									<p>affordable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>		
								236.28	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								136.73	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the 	Allow

										<p>suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
								137.36	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Peter Nunns	196.7	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Peter Nunns	196.8	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Andrew Flanagan	198.1	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	136.21	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

								136.40	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								137.24	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute</p>	Allow

										walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Andrew Flanagan	198.2	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Andrew Flanagan	198.13	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.3	Support	Supports the Johnsonville Rail Line no longer being classified as rapid transit. The train line is vulnerable to incremental weather and climate change. It is not frequent or reliable enough for people to rely on. It only works for people who work in walking distance of the railway station.	Retain the Johnsonville Rail Line as notified (not being classified as rapid transit).	Reject	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.4	Oppose	Considers that increased densification along the Johnsonville Rail Line will not necessarily result in increased usage of public transport and less car usage. All the increased densification will result in increased traffic density as people will opt for the more convenient form of personal transport. Considers that densification will likely result in a large number of family vehicles parked on the street, making them difficult to navigate. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that densification is not concentrated in suburbs along the Johnsonville Rail Line. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject The submitter comments on six plus storey developments within 15 minutes walking distance of Johnsonville Line stations. This extent of intensification has not been proposed at any planning stage. See body of report.	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Angus Hodgson	200.4	Support	Supports the National Policy Statement on Urban Development as a coherent tool supporting city councils in planning for denser urban forms across New Zealand.	Not specified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Wellington City Youth Council	201.18	Amend	<p>Considers that housing 10-20 minutes from the central city is still a relatively desirable distance from the city where many people commute to for work.</p> <p>Considers that transport options are very important, and these distances are highly conducive towards active or public transport which can shelter residents from the cost of lengthy commutes.</p> <p>Considers that character precincts would still be exempt from these provisions so it is important that the higher-density provisions go far enough.</p> <p>Considers that it inconsistent to now have 10 minute walking catchments from the CBD and mass rapid transit hubs given the additional time required to travel on mass rapid transit compared to when walking is the only aspect of the transport journey.</p>	Amend walkable catchment areas around the city centre zone where high density residential development is enabled to 20 minutes.	Accept in part – recommend increasing catchment to 15 minutes	Yes	136.19	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p> <p>[Inferred submission point].</p>	Allow
								136.63	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. 	Allow

										<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
								137.22	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason] [Inferred reference to submission 201.18]</p>	Allow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments /	Wellington City Youth Council	201.19	Amend	Considers that housing 10-20 minutes from the central city is still a relatively desirable distance from the city where many people commute to for work.	Amend walkable catchment areas around rapid transit stops where high density residential development is enabled to 20 minutes.	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments –	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement				<p>Considers that transport options are very important, and these distances are highly conducive towards active or public transport which can shelter residents from the cost of lengthy commutes.</p> <p>Considers that character precincts would still be exempt from these provisions so it is important that the higher-density provisions go far enough.</p> <p>Considers that it inconsistent to now have 10 minute walking catchments from the CBD and mass rapid transit hubs given the additional time required to travel on mass rapid transit compared to when walking is the only aspect of the transport journey.</p>	[Inferred decision requested]	see report					
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Wellington City Youth Council	201.20	Amend	<p>Opposes Reversing the removal of high-density walking catchments along the Johnsonville train line.</p> <p>Opposes carving out suburbs to exclude from development without compelling justification.</p>	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line is classified as rapid transit.	Accept	Yes	114.13	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Disallow</p> <p>Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).</p>

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

								82.16	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are “planned” in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of “planned” in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Wellington City Youth Council	201.21	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that existing public transport corridors should be improved and utilised to promote climate- friendly housing development.	Addressed in Stream 9		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Dougal and Libby List	207.2	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 “height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters”.	Not specified.	Addressed in Stream 2		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Craig Forrester	210.2	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 “height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters”.	Not specified.	Addressed in Stream 2		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Anna Jackson	222.8	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as rapid transit. The use of trains should be encouraged.	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as a Mass Rapid Transit Line.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments /	Nick Humphries	223.2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the PDP should do the minimum required by legislation with regards to housing intensification.	Reject	no	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement											
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Ruapapa Limited	225.1	Support	Considers that it would be unreasonable to expect local residents, many of whom are elderly, to walk more than 10 minutes (800m) to services. Weather conditions also make a larger walking catchment impractical.	Retain Walkable Catchments (at 10 minutes) from the edge of the city centre zone as notified.	Reject – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ	Yes	130.13	Support	Living Streets Aotearoa support retention of existing walk catchment and amend to a 10 minute catchment.	Allow Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to more equitable 10 minutes.
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Ruapapa Limited	225.2	Amend	Considers steep side streets and lack of access for emergency vehicles among other matters mean that residential side streets should be a qualifying matter [refer to original submission for further reason]	Seeks that 'Residential Side Streets' are recognised as a qualifying matter.	Reject	no	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Lorraine and Richard Smith	230.10	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to use a comprehensive, holistic definition of character as a qualifying matter under the National Policy Statement-Urban Development.	Stream 2		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Richard W Keller	232.6	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks that walkable catchments to rapid transit are increased to 15 minutes.	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Richard W Keller	232.7	Amend	Considers that walkable catchments should be extended around centres.	Seeks that walkable catchments are extended around centres and mass transit hubs.	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments, and 15 minutes for CCZ – see report	Yes	131.25	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more	Allow

									<p>affordable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>		
								136.9	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								136.53	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the 	Allow

									<p>suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
							137.11	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Richard W Keller	232.8	Amend	Considers that walkable catchments should be extended around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walkable catchments are extended around mass transit hubs.	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	233.7	Support	Supports Johnsonville Line not being classified as a Mass Rapid Transit line. Considers that the Johnsonville Line does not meet the NPS-UD’s definition of rapid transit. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain Johnsonville Line as not being classified as rapid transit as notified.	Oppose	Yes	114.14	Support	The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services. Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi. In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service. Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Disallow Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	233.8	Support	Considers that 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable distance in the context of Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Retain Walkable Catchments around the City Centre Zone at 10 minutes as notified.	Reject – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ	Yes	69.89	Support	Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings 10min walkable catchment Specific heritage identification and assessment Views contributing to sense of place and identity Extend Character Precincts per Boffa Miskell Boffa Miskell streetscapes Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings CCZ encroachment on residential zones	Allow

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

Zealand Coastal Policy Statement										Old St Pauls height controls Preserve viewshalls	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.9	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	The submission summary does not reflect the original submission		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.10	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres .	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	The submission summary does not reflect the original submission		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Victoria Stace	235.1	Support	Supports a 10 minute walkable catchment. Due to Wellingtons weather and topography, walking for more than 10 minutes to a commercial area is not practicable. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain Walkable Catchments (at 10 minutes) as notified.	Reject – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ	Yes	131.46	Oppose	Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons: - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delievers with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow
								136.74	Oppose	The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons: - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments.	Disallow

										<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. - People will walk/cycle to the city despite weather conditions, evidence provided by submitter. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
								235.1	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments /	Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	237.1	Support	Supports a 10 minute walkable catchment. Due to Wellingtons weather and topography, walking for more than 10 minutes to a commercial area is not practicable.	Retain Walkable Catchments (at 10 minutes) as notified.	Reject – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ	Yes	130.12	Support	Living Streets Aotearoa support retention of existing walk catchment and amend to a 10 minute catchment.	Allow Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to a more equitable 10 minutes.

National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement				<p>Considers that there are already many areas within the 10 minute catchment for development so increasing is unnecessary.</p> <p>Due to the town belt and propensity to walk lowering over distance, extending walking catchment has diminishing returns.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>				131.23	Oppose	<p>Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delivered with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow
				136.51				Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. - The original submitter believes that extending the area for intensification will not generate additional walking activity due to their propensity to walk and the environmental conditions. The further submitter notes that people will walk/active commute in any conditions. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow	

								137.3	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	237.2	Not specified	Considers that there are qualifying matters that apply to Hay Street and limit its development potential.	Seeks that development in Hay Street is restricted due to qualifying matters.	Reject	No	82.295	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow
								136.85	Oppose	Oppose points 237.2, 237.3, & 237.5 to restrict development due to 'qualifying matters' and retain Hay Street as MRZ. Qualifying Matters are set out in s771 of the RMA Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act 2021. Hay Street itself does not have any qualifying matters. Site specific limitations are addressed in a s88 RMA report Assessment of Environmental Effects. While Oriental Bay's special character has been addressed in the special Precinct Height Control's (PREC-03) overlay, it is not a Qualifying Matter. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Regan Dooley	239.6	Amend	Opposes the decision from Pūroro Āmua Planning & Environment Committee meeting on 23 June 2022 the council voted to reduce walking catchments from 15 minutes' walking distance of areas around the central city and metropolitan areas to just 10 minutes.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased.	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Regan Dooley	239.7	Amend	Opposes the decision from Pūroro Āmua Planning & Environment Committee meeting on 23 June 2022 the council voted to reduce walking catchments from 15 minutes' walking distance of areas around the central city and metropolitan areas to just 10 minutes.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased.	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	131.20	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
								136.3	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking	Allow

										<p>catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
								136.48	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								137.1	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs</p>	Allow

										where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation. WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Regan Dooley	239.8	Amend	Opposes the decision from Pūrora Āmua Planning & Environment Committee meeting on 23 June 2022 the council voted to excluded the Johnsonville line from the definition of rapid transit.	Seeks an amendment to make the Johnsonville Line considered Rapid Transit for the purposes of the NPS-UD.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Richard Martin	244.1	Support	Supports a 10 minute walking catchment as 15 minutes is not workable in Oriental Bay due to topography and existing settlement styles. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain walkable catchments as notified (at 10 minutes).	Reject – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Paul Ridley-Smith	245.1	Support	Supports a 10 minute walkable catchment. Due to Wellingtons weather, geography and demographics, walking for more than 10 minutes to a commercial area is not practicable. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain Walkable Catchments (at 10 minutes) as notified.	Reject – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ	Yes	136.88	Oppose	We oppose point 245.1 to retain the 10-minute walkable catchment. The original submitter has cited that larger walkable catchments spread development inappropriately given Wellington’s geography, weather, and demographics. The 2018 census found that 19.3% of Wellingtonians either walk or jog to work, a figure which is almost four times that of the national average. This shows that many Wellingtonians choose to walk despite the geography and weather. [See original further submission for full reasoning].	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Generation Zero Inc	254.14	Amend	Considers that a 10-minute walkable catchment is inconsistent with the policy direction of the NPS-UD and the approach of other Tier 1 local authorities and not supported by a robust section 32 assessment, rather decisions by Councillors which the submitter does not agree	Seeks that the area of the walkable catchment around the edge of the City Centre Zone where 6 storey development must be enabled be increased to 15 minutes.	Accept	Yes	89.75	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission to the extent that this aligns with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow
								131.36	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing,	Allow

Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement				with.					<p>and the climate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
							136.64	<p>Support</p> <p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow	

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.7	Support	Supports the fact that character precincts (MRZ-PREC-01 and MRZ-PREC-02) serves as a qualifying matter, and thus also potentially limits the pressure on Three Waters (THW) Infrastructure .	Retain National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement chapter as notified ((With regards to Character Precincts being Qualifying Matters).	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Bidy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir	275.8	Amend	Considers that this allows a suburb specific response to assessing the ability of the THW Infrastructure to accommodate impacts on wastewater, water supply and storm water can be taken.	Seeks that the current state of Three Waters Infrastructure in Newtown be regarded as a qualifying matter.	Addressed in Stream 2		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Onslow Residents Community Association	283.5	Support	Supports using NPS-UD Policy 3 (d) along the Johnsonville Railway Line. Considers that Wellington City Council defined Johnsonville Line as rapid transit without defining explicit criteria and relied on definitions used for other purposes that exclude the required characteristics of the NPSD-UD. The "Review of the designation of the Johnsonville Railway Line as a Rapid Transit System "paper showed that Johnsonville Line is not rapid transit, and if it was classified as so, would not provide sufficient capacity, increase in carbon emissions and congestion, and degrade the wellbeing along the catchment. The GWRC paper "WELLINGTON RAIL PROGRAMME BUSINESS CASE" excludes the Johnsonville Line and defines criteria for Rapid Transit Stops that the Johnsonville Line cannot meet. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain the Johnsonville Line classification as notified (not Rapid Transit).	Reject	Yes	114.15	Support	The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be "frequent" and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services. Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi. In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service. Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also	Disallow Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).

										invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
								54.49	Oppose	<p>Considers that The Johnsonville Line meets the definition of “mass rapid transit” (MRT) in the NPS-UD. The elements of the definition should be viewed wholistically and not each as a bar to cross.</p> <p>The NPS-UD is not a transport document but a land-use document. The MRT definition is for enabling more housing where good infrastructure exists or is planned, and new housing is easily absorbed. While external transport planning documents are relevant, they are not determinative.</p> <p>The MRT definition should be future looking – to the frequencies likely when new residents are present, and when other changes are made (eg. Wellington Station crossover improvements, integrated ticketing, golden mile improvements). The existence of bus routes that are may be faster to the Central City at certain times of day actually supports the Johnsonville line being MRT. It indicates a transit-rich area that is a well-functioning urban environment capable of supporting more housing.</p>	Disallow Seeks that the Johnsonville Train Line is designated as mass rapid transit (and its associated train stations)
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Onslow Residents Community Association	283.6	Oppose	<p>Opposes any attempt to reinstate NPS-UD Policy 3 (c) (i) along the Johnsonville Railway Line.</p> <p>Considers that Wellington City Council defined Johnsonville Line as rapid transit without defining explicit criteria and relied on definitions used for other purposes that exclude the required characteristics of the NPSD-UD.</p> <p>The "Review of the designation of the Johnsonville Railway Line as a Rapid Transit System "paper showed that Johnsonville Line is not rapid transit, and if it was classified as so, would not provide sufficient capacity, increase in carbon emissions and congestion, and degrade the wellbeing along the catchment.</p> <p>The GWRC paper "WELLINGTON RAIL PROGRAMME BUSINESS CASE" excludes the Johnsonville Line and defines criteria for Rapid Transit Stops that the Johnsonville Line cannot meet.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Retain the Johnsonville Line classification as notified (not Rapid Transit).	Reject	Yes	114.16	Support	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p>	Disallow Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).

										Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
		54.50	Oppose	Considers that The Johnsonville Line meets the definition of “mass rapid transit” (MRT) in the NPS-UD. The elements of the definition should be viewed holistically and not each as a bar to cross. The NPS-UD is not a transport document but a land-use document. The MRT definition is for enabling more housing where good infrastructure exists or is planned, and new housing is easily absorbed. While external transport planning documents are relevant, they are not determinative. The MRT definition should be future looking – to the frequencies likely when new residents are present, and when other changes are made (eg. Wellington Station crossover improvements, integrated ticketing, golden mile improvements). The existence of bus routes that are may be faster to the Central City at certain times of day actually supports the Johnsonville line being MRT. It indicates a transit-rich area that is a well-functioning urban environment capable of supporting more housing.							Disallow Seeks that the Johnsonville Train Line is designated as mass rapid transit (and its associated train stations)
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Steve Dunn	288.4	Oppose	Considers the provisions of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS- UD) is a blunt instrument when considering inner city housing for Newtown.	Not specified	Reject	no	v			
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Priscilla Williams	293.4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Seeks that the houses that display character in the area spanning Wesley Road, Aurora Terrace and Bolton Street are considered a qualifying matter.	Addressed in Stream 2					
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy	Dawid Wojasz	295.4	Amend	Considers that Johnsonville Rail line should be considered as rapid transit for the purposes of its impact of Zoning and walkable catchments. It is a significant rail corridor and high density housing should be encouraged along its route to allow efficient access to public transport.	Seeks that a 15 minute walkable catchment be applied around stations along the Johnsonville rail line to enable high density residential zone. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part Accept considering Johnsonville Line as rapid transit, but recommend 5	Yes	3.15	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow

Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement						and 10 minute walkable catchments. See body of report.					
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.10	Amend	Supports the PDP subject to amendments to ensure that the intensification outcomes required by the Resource Management Act 1991, as amended by the RM (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Act 2021 and the NPS-UD 2020 are enabled.	Seeks that walkable catchments around the City Centre Zone are increased to 15 minutes.	Accept	Yes	82.40	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
				96.74				Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow	
				131.42				Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow	
								136.1	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with	Allow

									<p>demand.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
							136.20	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

								136.70	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								137.23	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute</p>	Allow

										walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.11	Amend	Supports the PDP subject to amendments to ensure that the intensification outcomes required by the Resource Management Act 1991, as amended by the RM (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Act 2021 and the NPS-UD 2020 are enabled. Considers that walkable catchments around the City Centre Zone and Metropolitan Centres Zones should be defined as those within a distance which appropriately reflects the provision and frequency of public transport, the draw of the services and amenity within the city centre, the connectivity of the city centre and the Wellington topography, being 15 minutes.	Seeks that walkable catchments around the Metropolitan Centres Zones are increased to 15 minutes.	Accept in part – recommend Kilbirnie MCZ to have 10 minute catchment (or future plan change for this)	Yes	82.41	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								96.75	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.12	Amend	Supports the PDP subject to amendments to ensure that the intensification outcomes required by the Resource Management Act 1991, as amended by the RM (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Act 2021 and the NPS-UD 2020 are enabled. Considers that walkable catchments around the City Centre Zone and Metropolitan Centres Zones should be defined as those within a distance which appropriately reflects the provision and frequency of public transport, the draw of the services and amenity within the city centre, the connectivity of the city centre and the Wellington topography, being 15 minutes.	Seeks that walkable catchments around mass rapid transit stops are increased to 15 minutes.	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	82.42	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								96.76	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.13	Amend	Supports the PDP subject to amendments to ensure that the intensification outcomes required by the Resource Management Act 1991, as amended by the RM (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Act 2021 and the NPS-UD 2020 are enabled.	Seeks that the Johnsonville Rail Line is classified as a rapid transit route.	Accept	Yes	92.9	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are “planned” in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of “planned” in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	Disallow

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Roland Sapsford	305.26	Amend	<p>Considers that the NPS-UD requires the Council to take a place-based approach to setting District Plan rules, and this should be applied to Aro Valley, which is a suburb with unique characteristics.</p> <p>Considers that full use should be made of the NPS-UD qualifying matters and statutory framework to ensure that intensification in Aro Valley maintains and enhances the amenity and environment of Aro Valley, and the lived experience of new and existing residents.</p> <p>Considers that the NPS-UD and Wellington Spatial Plan require interpretation in a local context in order to enable sustainable development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for details/contextual information]</p>	Seeks that further consideration is given to the unique characteristics of Aro Valley, including through the use of qualifying matters. [Inferred decision sought]	Reject	no	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Wilma Sherwin	306.2	Support	Supports Johnsonville Line not being classified as a Mass Rapid Transit line. The Johnsonville Line is a suburban commuter line with many stops, steep and winding tracks and few passing bays that cannot accommodate faster, longer or more trains. It has limited capacity. It is not a Rapid Transit System.	Retain Johnsonville Line as not being classified as a Mass Rapid Transit line.	Reject	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Wilma Sherwin	306.3	Amend	Considers that 3-waters infrastructure is a qualifying matter under NPS-UD subpart 6, clause 3.32.	Seeks that 3-waters infrastructure is interpreted as a qualifying matter under the NPS-UD subpart 6, clause 3.32.	Reject		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Svend Heeselholt Henne Hansen	308.2	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	131.2	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce 	Allow

										carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Svend Heeselholt Henne Hansen	308.3	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Svend Heeselholt Henne Hansen	308.7		Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject	No	96.58	Oppose	Luke Stewart, Matthew Reweti, Miriam Moore, Patrick Wilkes, Svend Hansen — seeks that MDRZ height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments around all rail stations. Opposed where this is inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Rod Bray	311.1	Oppose	Walkable Catchments under the NPS-UD should be reverted back to 15 minutes instead of 10 minute, as a large portion of city edge residents walk to work. The Auckland Council's walkable catchments analysis found that an excess of 50% of commuters walked further than 800m to their busway station. Although 'walkability' varies between individuals, a 15 minute walk remains realistic for a significant proportion of commuters. WCC should fall in line with the NPS to increase housing supply around CBD.	Opposes 10 minute walkable catchments as notified.	Accept in part	yes	130.6	Oppose	Walk catchments at 15 minutes are already in excess of that required. A walk catchment of 10 minutes is sufficient and is more equitable to the broad and varied range of people with different needs and abilities in a community. Walk catchments are intended as a planning tool for access to specific destinations such as a public transport stop. They are not intended as a general tool to an 'inner city' zone which may not have any of the everyday services needed, for instance access to a fresh food outlet. 10 minutes walk at an average speed is slightly less than one kilometre for a fit healthy adult. It does not encompass all the community and says nothing about the amenity, service levels or attractiveness of the walk environment. Research shows that a best practice environment (such as following all the requirements in the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide/ Pedestrian Network Guidance) makes it easier for most people to walk further. A walkable catchment does not of itself provide this. Other provision to ensure this best practice must be embedded in the PDP.	Disallow Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to a more equitable 10 minutes.

								131.40	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								136.23	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full</p>	Allow

									reasoning].		
								136.68	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								137.26	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a</p>	Allow

										large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Rod Bray	311.2	Amend	Walkable Catchments under the NPS-UD should be reverted back to 15 minutes instead of 10 minute, as a large portion of city edge residents walk to work. The Auckland Council's walkable catchments analysis found that an excess of 50% of commuters walked further than 800m to their busway station. Although 'walkability' varies between individuals, a 15 minute walk remains realistic for a significant proportion of commuters. WCC should fall in line with the NPS to increase housing supply around CBD.	Reinstate walkable catchments at 15 minutes in High Density Residential Zone in accordance with Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Accept	Yes	130.7	Oppose	Walk catchments at 15 minutes are already in excess of that required. A walk catchment of 10 minutes is sufficient and is more equitable to the broad and varied range of people with different needs and abilities in a community. Walk catchments are intended as a planning tool for access to specific destinations such as a public transport stop. They are not intended as a general tool to an 'inner city' zone which may not have any of the everyday services needed, for instance access to a fresh food outlet. 10 minutes walk at an average speed is slightly less than one kilometre for a fit healthy adult. It does not encompass all the community and says nothing about the amenity, service levels or attractiveness of the walk environment. Research shows that a best practice environment (such as following all the requirements in the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide/ Pedestrian Network Guidance) makes it easier for most people to walk further. A walkable catchment does not of itself provide this. Other provision to ensure this best practice must be embedded in the PDP.	Disallow
								131.41	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow

								136.24	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								136.69	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. 	Allow

										- The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	
		137.27	Support	Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation. WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Allow						
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.2	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Not specified.	Addressed in stream 2		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Richard Murcott	322.11	Amend	Considers that 'qualifying matters' for Character Precinct Areas have only been applied in a very limited way, leaving many high character value residential areas out in the cold and exposed; all unnecessarily. Greater protection of character areas is needed through the application of qualifying matters. The character	Seeks that qualifying matters in the Medium Density Residential Chapter be more inclusive of character values.	Addressed in stream 2		69.46	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow

Zealand Coastal Policy Statement				in Thorndon (NZ's oldest suburb) makes a significant contribution to Wellington's identity, and what makes this city attractive, liveable and different from others in NZ.							
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Trevor Farrer	332.1	Amend	Considers that the walking catchment around the central city, which would allow buildings up to six storeys within it, should be reinstated at 15 minutes rather than 10 minutes. Walking catchments of 10 minutes will reduce land available for density and housing supply around the city centre. Many successful cities around the world are climate-friendly, liveable and walkable, with good urban planning.	Amend walkable catchment areas to 15 minutes.	Accept	Yes	131.5	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Bruce Rae	334.2	Amend	Considers that the walkable catchment for Johnsonville should be 5 minutes. It is appreciated that the walkable catchments took the effects of topography into account, rather than pretending Wellington was flat. A significant amount has been spent fairly recently on the Johnsonville line to ensure it is capable of using the same trains/electric units as the rest of the network. Given the above, it appears inconsistent that while the proposed plan set the tawa walkable catchments at 5 minutes (down from 10) it has deleted the 10 minute Johnsonville line walkable catchments completely, rather than also cutting them down to 5 minutes. Maps should be revised to include 5 minute walkable catchments associated with Johnsonville line stations areas of High density residential, as has been done with the Kapiti line stations in Tawa. It is also noted that territorial authorities are able to decide how they will implement the national policy statement on Urban	Amend maps to include 5 minute walkable catchments associated with the Johnsonville line stations as areas of high density residential as has been done with the Kapiti Line stations in Tawa.	Accept in part recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – around Johnsonville Line stations - see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA

				Development 2020 . Thwart is not a synonym for implement, nor is the implementation task 'whether' rather than 'how'.							
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Property Council New Zealand	338.3	Amend	<p>Considers that the proposed a walkable catchment of 800 metres (or 10 minutes) for the City Centre zone is very limited and should be amended to 15 minutes. The current walkable catchment excludes Mount Victoria, Oriental Bay, Mount Cook and the area around Massey University Campus. Auckland, Hamilton and Christchurch city centres have a 1200 metres walkable catchment and Tauranga City have a 1500 metres walkable catchment. Limiting Wellington's walkable catchment will encourage urban sprawl, limit future intensification and be an impediment for the Council in achieving their carbon neutral goals.</p> <p>A 15 minute walkable catchment will better help the Council reach its commitment to reduce net carbon emissions to net zero by 2050, and will encourage more people to live closer to the city centre and reduce their carbon footprint.</p>	Reinstate Walkable Catchments at 15 minutes from the City Centre Zone in High Density Residential Zone under the NPS-UD - Policy 3.	Accept	Yes	37.1	Oppose	Considers that a limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for eg in Hay Street).	Disallow
								38.16	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to extend the walkable catchment above 10 minutes.	Disallow
								82.43	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								94.1	Oppose	Considers that a limit of ten minutes on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington, and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last five minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for Wilkinson Street). People's propensity to walk decreases with distance.	Disallow
								96.77	Oppose	<p>We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group.</p> <p>10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.</p>	Disallow
								131.47	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on 	Allow

									<p>private vehicles increases overall health.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>		
								136.22	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								136.75	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density 	Allow

										<p>Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
								137.25	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal	Property Council New Zealand	338.4	Amend	Considers that the NPS-UD should be clarified to specify the starting point for the City Centre walkable catchment zone. Current mapping is unclear as to where the starting point is established, unlike other council's maps who clearly identify this.	Clarify the starting point of the City Centre Zone walkable catchment in the NPS-UD.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Policy Statement												
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.50	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that in classifying the Johnsonville Rail Line as a rapid transit service, the Regional Transport Committee referenced the definition of rapid transit contained in the NPS-UD and considered the definitions for PT1 classification contained in Waka Kotahi’s One Network Framework that includes all metro rail corridors and the Regional Public Transport Plan.</p> <p>Local authorities identify and enable rapid transit services within the Wellington Region through the Regional Land Transport Plan and the Joint Leadership Committee. This in turn enables territorial authorities to ‘up-zone’ surrounding walkable catchment areas under NPS-UD Policy 3c. It is important to note that the identification of a rapid transit service in the Regional Land Transport Plan enables changes to district plan zoning to occur but does not require them.</p> <p>The Johnsonville Rail Line is a key part of the region’s transport network, and well placed to increase its future role. This rail line is a dedicated public transport corridor. As a dedicated corridor, it does not have the challenges of segregation with other users required on other mixed-mode corridors. It is a key component of the regional transport network and is integrated into this network.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes the Johnsonville Railway Line not being classified as a rapid transit line and seeks amendment.	Accept	Yes	114.17	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Kotahi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Kotahi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow	
									80.1	Oppose	<p>Considers the Johnsonville Rail Line does not meet NPS-UD definition of a rapid transit service. Seeks that the decision of Wellington City Council in the Proposed District Plan as notified stands.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission - 283]</p>	Disallow
									80.3	Support	<p>Considers the identification of a rapid transit service in the Regional Land Transport Plan enables changes to district plan zoning to occur but does not require them.</p>	Allow

											require them is allowed.
								82.5	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are “planned” in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of “planned” in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	Disallow
								89.13	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the decision requested to classify Johnsonville Railway Line as a rapid transit line.	Allow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.51	Amend	Considers that in classifying the Johnsonville Rail Line as a rapid transit service, the Regional Transport Committee referenced the definition of rapid transit contained in the NPS-UD and considered the definitions for PT1 classification contained in Waka Kotahi’s One Network Framework that includes all metro rail corridors and the Regional Public Transport Plan. Local authorities identify and enable rapid transit services within the Wellington Region through the Regional Land Transport Plan and the Joint Leadership Committee. This in turn enables territorial authorities to ‘up-zone’ surrounding walkable catchment areas under NPS-UD Policy 3c. It is important to note that the identification of a rapid transit service in the Regional Land Transport Plan enables changes to district plan zoning to occur but does not require them. The Johnsonville Rail Line is a key part of the region’s transport network, and well placed to increase its future role. This rail line is a dedicated public transport corridor. As a dedicated corridor, it does not have the challenges of segregation with other users required on other mixed-mode corridors. It is a key component of the regional transport network and is integrated into this network. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks to add the Johnsonville Railway Line as a rapid transit line as classified in the RLTP 2021 and the Wellington Regional Growth Framework and amend the zoning accordingly where appropriate.	Accept	Yes	114.18	Oppose	The UPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services. Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi. In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service. Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Disallow Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).

								80.2	Oppose	Considers the Johnsonville Rail Line does not meet NPS-UD definition of a rapid transit service. Seeks that the decision if Wellington City Council in the Proposed District Plan as notified stands. [Refer to original submission - 283]	Disallow Seeks that the part of the submission relating to the Johnsonville Rail Line being classified as a rapid transit line is disallowed.
								80.4	Support	Considers the identification of a rapid transit service in the Regional Land Transport Plan enables changes to district plan zoning to occur but does not require them.	Allow Seeks that the part of the submission that states that the identification of rapid transit service in the Regional Land Transport Plan enables changes to district plan zoning to occur but does not require them is allowed.
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.4	Amend	Considers that Character Housing and Areas should be listed as Qualifying Matters limiting 6-storey heights in High Density Residential Zones.	Seeks that character be a qualifying matter in High Density Residential Zones.	Stream 2		89.88	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.5	Amend	Considers that sunshine access and privacy should be considered as Qualifying Matters when considering the suitability of sites for 6-story blocks.	Seeks that sunshine and privacy be treated as Qualifying Matters in High Density Residential Zones.	Reject	no	89.89	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington, particularly as these matters are managed via standards.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Waka Kotahi	370.42	Amend	Considers that in the interim period before the district plan provisions become operative, noise should be introduced as a qualifying matter to manage the noise effects of having a State Highway next to areas that can be developed, or new noise sensitive activities.	Seeks that Noise R3 rules are applied as a qualifying matter.	Reject	no	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Waka Kotahi	370.43	Oppose	The submitter does not agree that the ten-minute walkable catchments as proposed in the notified plan realise the development capacity required by the NPS-UD. [See original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that high density residential zoning to be applied to: - A minimum 1.5km catchment from the edge of the city centre zone. - A minimum 800m catchment from the edge of all metropolitan zones and the edge of all existing	Accept in part – recommend 15 minutes catchment from CCZ, 10 minutes from Johnsonville MCZ, and Kilbirnie MCZ	Yes	37.3	Oppose	Considers that the Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow
								38.20	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to extend the walkable catchment above 10 minute.	Disallow

				and planned rapid transit stops – including those along the Johnsonville line. - A 400m walkable catchment from the edge of Local Centre Zones. The catchment should be measured along pedestrian infrastructure (existing and planned) rather than 'as the crow flies'.	(or future plan change for this), and 5 and 10 minute catchments from stations on the Johnsonville Line. See body of report.		82.14	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are "planned" in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	Disallow
							82.51	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
							84.94	Support	Greater Wellington consider Johnsonville Rail Line should be classified a rapid transit service to align with the Regional Land Transport Plan which support the 'upzoning' of walkable catchments. Johnsonville Rail Line is recognised as a key part of the region's transport network.	Allow Seeks review of walkable catchments and reclassification of Johnsonville Rail Line as a rapid transit service.
							89.16	Support	Kāinga Ora supports the submission seeking high density residential zoning for the identified walkable catchments, to the extent consistent with Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow
							94.3	Oppose	Considers that a limit of ten minutes on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington, and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last five minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for Wilkinson Street). People's propensity to walk decreases with distance.	Disallow
							96.85	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, ViLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
							114.50	Oppose	Considers that by deciding on 10 Minutes as the size of the Walking Catchment as measured from the edge of the Metropolitan MDRZ under the NPS-UD, the WCC officers are claiming Johnsonville residents within 15 minutes walking to facilities should be in the MDRZ and permitted for high density housing. Considers that the Johnsonville Walking Report	Disallow Seeks that the walking catchment from the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone is amended to 5 minutes (400m) from the edge of the Metropolitan Zone.

									<p>report does not provide any evidence or justification that the residential areas beyond the Johnsonville MDRA 10 Minute Walking Catchment are now walking accessible when they were excluded from the WCC's own analysis in 2013. In its submission to the 2021 WCC Spatial Plan, the JCA requested the proposed MDRZ walking catchment be reduced from 10 minutes to 5 minutes from the edge of the Metropolitan Business Zone for this reason. This is based on a correct and complete application of the MfE Guidance on setting the Walking Catchments and on the WCC's previous evidence to the Environment Court that the current MDRA is the 10 Minute Walking Catchment for Johnsonville. Finally, when the council reduced the CBD walking catchment to 10 minutes from the CBD boundary, it retained the 10 minutes catchment for Johnsonville. Considers that this ignores MfE Guidance that "the centre's size can also affect the size of the catchment". Johnsonville is small for a Suburban Centre with a less employment than other "lesser" suburbs such as Newtown or Kilbirnie. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	
							136.17	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow

								136.81	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								137.20	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute</p>	Allow

										walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Jane Szentivanyi	376.4	Amend	Considers that particular focus needs to be taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (MDRZ) to the Central Area, especially on a street like Moir St where the plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values. Character and heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus be taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (MDRZ) to the Central Area.	Addressed in Stream 2		NA	NA	NA	NA
	WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.5	Amend	The walking catchments used in the district plan are inconsistent between the rapid transit stops they relate to. These are also more conservative than those being proposed by both Porirua and Hutt City, and considerably more conservative than those proposed by Auckland City. In light of the urgent need to reduce Wellingtonians' carbon footprint, reduce congestion, and significantly improve housing options, this makes no sense. We seek that the plan takes a consistent approach, applying the definition provided by Section 5.5 the MfE guidance in relation to the NPS-UD, and revising its walking catchment definitions to at least match those of its adjacent cities	Amend the walkable catchments associated with the central city, any areas classed as 'metropolitan centres' and with rapid transit stops to bring them in line with the approach being taken by Hutt City, Porirua and Auckland City, as follows: (a) A 15-minute walk (around 1200 metres) from the edge of the City Centre Zone; and (b) A 10-minute walk (around 800 metres) from existing and planned rapid transit stops (c) A 10-minute walk (around 800 metres) from the edge of a Metropolitan Centre Zone Within these areas, amend the zoning requirements accordingly, to reflect, as a minimum, increased building heights provisions of 6 storeys, and other bulk and location elements as relevant to a higher density zone.	Accept in part – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ, 5 and 10 minutes from rapid transit stops, 10 minutes from MCZ (though Kilbirnie's may be through a future plan change). See report	Yes	96.86	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.11	Amend	The walking catchments used in the district plan are inconsistent between the rapid transit stops they relate to. These are also more conservative than those being proposed by both Porirua and Hutt City, and considerably more conservative than those proposed by Auckland City. In light of the urgent need to reduce Wellingtonians' carbon footprint, reduce congestion, and significantly improve	Amend the walkable catchments associated with the central city, any areas classed as 'metropolitan centres' and with rapid transit stops to bring them in line with the approach being taken by Hutt City, Porirua and Auckland City, as follows: (a) A 15-minute walk (around	Accept in part – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ, 5 and 10 minutes from rapid transit stops, 10 minutes from MCZ (though Kilbirnie's may be through a	Yes	130.9	Oppose	Walk catchments at 15 minutes are already in excess of that required. A walk catchment of 10 minutes is sufficient and is more equitable to the broad and varied range of people with different needs and abilities in a community. Walk catchments are intended as a planning tool for access to specific destinations such as a public transport stop. They are not intended as a general tool to an 'inner city' zone which may not have any of the everyday services needed, for instance access to a fresh food outlet. 10 minutes walk at	Disallow Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to a more equitable 10 minutes.

				housing options, this makes no sense. We seek that the plan takes a consistent approach, applying the definition provided by Section 5.5 the MfE guidance in relation to the NPS-UD, and revising its walking catchment definitions to at least match those of its adjacent cities.	1200 metres) from the edge of the City Centre Zone; and A 10-minute walk (around 800 metres) from existing and planned rapid transit stops (c) A 10-minute walk (around 800 metres) from the edge of a Metropolitan Centre Zone	future plan change). See report				an average speed is slightly less than one kilometre for a fit healthy adult. It does not encompass all the community and says nothing about the amenity, service levels or attractiveness of the walk environment. Research shows that a best practice environment (such as following all the requirements in the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide/ Pedestrian Network Guidance) makes it easier for most people to walk further. A walkable catchment does not of itself provide this. Other provision to ensure this best practice must be embedded in the PDP. [Inferred reference to submission 377.11]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.4	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	3.22	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.5	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	3.23	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.6	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	3.24	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
								62.26	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
								136.33	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling,	Allow

									<p>supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
							136.38	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
							137.47	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to</p>	Allow

									<p>walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>		
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.7	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	3.25	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Oppose
								62.27	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.8	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that MRZ (Medium density residential zone) height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.16	Amend	Considers that walking catchments should extend: i. 15-20min/1500m walkable catchment from the edge of the City Centre Zone ii. 15min/800m walkable catchment from the edge of MCZ and from existing and planned rapid transit stops (including the Johnsonville Line) iii. 10 min/400-800m walkable catchment from Town Centre Zones. Notes that mapping changes are required for	Amend the walking catchments within the Proposed District Plan Maps to reflect the below: i. 15-20min/1500m walkable catchment from the edge of the City Centre Zone ii. 15min/800m walkable catchment from the edge of MCZ and from existing and planned rapid transit stops (including the Johnsonville Line) iii. 10 min/400-800m walkable	Accept in part – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ, 10 minutes from Johnsonville MCZ, 10 minutes from Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this, 5 and 10	Yes	3.32	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
								19.7	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking along the seafront without shelter difficult for residents and is unreasonable to adopt a greater walking distance than 10 mins in	Disallow

				this and has provided an example of mapping in Appendix 4 of the original submission. [Refer to original submission for further details].	catchment from Town Centre Zones. Refer to Appendix 4 of the original submission for an example map.	minutes from rapid transit stops – see report				that specific environment.	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.38	Support in part	The intent of the PDP to provide intensification within walkable catchments is generally supported. However an extension of walkable catchments is requested.	Retain walkable catchments with amendment.	Accept in part – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ, 10 minutes from Johnsonville MCZ, 10 minutes from Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this, 5 and 10 minutes from rapid transit stops – see report	yes	80.17	Oppose	Considers the proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Medium Density Residential Standards and would enable an unjustified level of development. Considers there is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary. Considers original submission contains the submitter's view of appropriate settings for our community. [Refer to original submission - 283]	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.39	Amend	Considers that walkable catchments should be extended to better align with Policy 3 of the NPSUD.	Seeks that walkable catchments are extended to better align with Policy 3 of the NPSUD.	Accept in part – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ, 10 minutes from Johnsonville MCZ, 10 minutes from Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this, 5 and 10 minutes from rapid transit stops – see report	Yes	80.18	Oppose	Considers the proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Medium Density Residential Standards and would enable an unjustified level of development. Considers there is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary. Considers original submission contains the submitter's view of appropriate settings for our community. [Refer to original submission - 283]	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.40	Amend	Considers that walking catchments should extend: i. 15-20min/1500m walkable catchment from the edge of the City Centre Zone ii. 15min/800m walkable catchment from the edge of MCZ and from existing and planned rapid transit stops (including the Johnsonville Line) iii. 10 min/400-800m walkable catchment from Town Centre Zones. Walkable catchment should be analysed by taking into consideration topography, amenities, and connectivity. Mapping changes are required to reflect amendments to the Centres hierarchy and a wider geographical spread of the HRZ. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including Appendix 4]	Seeks that walkable catchments extend: i. 15-20min/1500m walkable catchment from the edge of the City Centre Zone ii. 15min/800 m walkable catchment from the edge of MCZ and from existing and planned rapid transit stops (including the Johnsonville Line) iii. 10 min/400-800m walkable catchment from Town Centre Zones.	Accept in part – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ, 10 minutes from Johnsonville MCZ, 10 minutes from Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this, 5 and 10 minutes from rapid transit stops – see report	Yes	37.5	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were	

									carefully laid out there are relevant here.			
					[Refer to original submission, Appendix 4 for proposed walkable catchment mapping]				38.17	Oppose	Opposes those parts of Kāinga Ora’s submission that seek to extend the walkable catchment above 10 minutes.	Disallow
									80.19	Oppose	Considers the proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Medium Density Residential Standards and would enable an unjustified level of development. Considers there is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary. Considers original submission contains the submitter’s view of appropriate settings for our community. [Refer to original submission - 283]	Disallo
									84.26	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.
									94.5	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay).Oppose review of the O’ Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow
									96.6	Oppose	The proposal to extend walking catchments is opposed. Walking catchments have been extensively debated and it is inappropriate to alter them by submission at this stage. 10 minutes is a suitable walking distance in a city of Wellington’s topography and weather.	Disallow
									107.37	Support	Stride supports extending the walkable catchments as proposed. It is appropriate to apply a 15 minute walkable catchment to the Metropolitan zone to reflect the level of amenities and services provided.	Allow
									108.37	Support	Investore supports extending the walkable catchments as proposed. It is appropriate to apply a 15 minute walkable catchment to the Metropolitan zone to reflect the level of amenities and services provided.	Allow
									114.34	Oppose	Considers that by deciding on 10 Minutes as the size of the Walking Catchment as measured from the edge of the Metropolitan MDRZ under the NPS-UD, the WCC officers are claiming Johnsonville residents within 15 minutes walking to facilities should be in the MDRZ and permitted for high density housing.	Disallow Seeks that the walking catchment from the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone is amended to 5 minutes (400m) from the edge of the Metropolitan

									Considers that the Johnsonville Walking Report report does not provide any evidence or justification that the residential areas beyond the Johnsonville MDRA 10 Minute Walking Catchment are now walking accessible when they were excluded from the WCC's own analysis in 2013. In its submission to the 2021 WCC Spatial Plan, the JCA requested the proposed MDRZ walking catchment be reduced from 10 minutes to 5 minutes from the edge of the Metropolitan Business Zone for this reason. This is based on a correct and complete application of the MFE Guidance on setting the Walking Catchments and on the WCC's previous evidence to the Environment Court that the current MDRA is the 10 Minute Walking Catchment for Johnsonville. Finally, when the council reduced the CBD walking catchment to 10 minutes from the CBD boundary, it retained the 10 minutes catchment for Johnsonville. Considers that this ignores MFE Guidance that "the centre's size can also affect the size of the catchment". Johnsonville is small for a Suburban Centre with a less employment than other "lesser" suburbs such as Newtown or Kilbirnie. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Zone.
							117.6	Oppose	The proposal to extend walking catchments is opposed. Walking catchments have been extensively debated and it is inappropriate to alter them by submission at this stage. 10 minutes is a suitable walking distance in a city of Wellington's topography and weather.	Disallow
							131.38	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow

								136.12	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								136.66	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. 	Allow

									<p>- The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>		
								137.15	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.41	Amend	Considers that the spatial application of the HRZ should extend across the urban environment.	Amend the extent of the High Density Residential Zone across the urban environment, including at least: - 15-20min/1500m from the edge of the City Centre Zone (CCZ) - 10min/800m from the edge of Metro Centre Zone (MCZ) and from existing and planned rapid transit stops (including the Johnsonville Line) 10 min/800m from Town Centre Zones (TCZ)	Accept in part – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ, 10 minutes from Johnsonville MCZ, 10 minutes from Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this, 5 and 10 minutes from rapid transit stops – see report	Yes	114.20	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly</p>	Disallow Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).

									<p>2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>		
								54.5	Support	Support extending walkable catchments.	<p>Allow</p> <p>Seeks the extension of the walkable catchments and increased height limits in the walkable catchments.</p>
								80.20	Oppose	<p>Considers the proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Medium Density Residential Standards and would enable an unjustified level of development. Considers there is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary. Considers original submission contains the submitter's view of appropriate settings for our community. [Refer to original submission - 283]</p>	Disallow
								96.7	Oppose	The submission to extend the HRZ across the urban environment is opposed. This would cause widespread impacts on existing communities and is unwarranted as sufficient capacity has been created for needed housing.	Disallow
								114.35	Oppose	<p>Considers that by deciding on 10 Minutes as the size of the Walking Catchment as measured from the edge of the Metropolitan MDRZ under the NPS-UD, the WCC officers are claiming Johnsonville residents within 15 minutes walking to facilities should be in the MDRZ and permitted for high density housing.</p> <p>Considers that the Johnsonville Walking Report report does not provide any evidence or justification that the residential areas beyond the Johnsonville MDRA 10 Minute Walking Catchment are now walking accessible when they were excluded from the WCC's own analysis in 2013. In its submission to the 2021 WCC Spatial</p>	<p>Disallow</p> <p>Seeks that the walking catchment from the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone is amended to 5 minutes (400m) from the edge of the Metropolitan Zone.</p>

									Plan, the JCA requested the proposed MDRZ walking catchment be reduced from 10 minutes to 5 minutes from the edge of the Metropolitan Business Zone for this reason. This is based on a correct and complete application of the MfE Guidance on setting the Walking Catchments and on the WCC's previous evidence to the Environment Court that the current MDRA is the 10 Minute Walking Catchment for Johnsonville. Finally, when the council reduced the CBD walking catchment to 10 minutes from the CBD boundary, it retained the 10 minutes catchment for Johnsonville. Considers that this ignores MfE Guidance that "the centre's size can also affect the size of the catchment". Johnsonville is small for a Suburban Centre with a less employment than other "lesser" suburbs such as Newtown or Kilbirnie. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
							117.7	Oppose	The submission to extend the HRZ across the urban environment is opposed. This would cause widespread impacts on existing communities and is unwarranted as sufficient capacity has been created for needed housing.	Disallow
							136.13	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow

								136.67	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								137.16	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute</p>	Allow

										walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.42	Amend	Considers that additional height and density should be provided for within a walkable catchment of centres to enable more intensification in areas of high accessibility to key centre.	Amend walkable catchments to provide additional height and density within a walkable catchment of centres to enable more intensification in areas of high accessibility to key centre, including: - At least 12 storeys within a 400m walkable catchment of the City Centre Zone and at least 8 storeys within a 800m walkable catchment - At least 10 storeys within a 400m walkable catchment of the Metropolitan Centre Zone. At least 8 storeys within a 400m walkable catchment of Town Centre Zones.	Reject	No	37.6	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow
								38.18	Oppose	Opposes those parts of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to extend the walkable catchment above 10 minutes.	Disallow
								54.6	Support	Support extending height limits within walkable catchments.	Allow Seeks the extension of the walkable catchments and increased height limits in the walkable catchments.
								80.21	Oppose	Considers the proposed amendments go well beyond the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Medium Density Residential Standards and would enable an unjustified level of development. Considers there is no evidence that this level of enablement is necessary. Considers original submission contains the submitter's view of appropriate settings for our community. [Refer to original submission - 283	Disallow
								94.6	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow

								96.8	Oppose	Amendments to heights within walking catchments is opposed. These have already been extensively debated. Additional capacity is not needed and would cause significant impact on amenity.	Disallow
								114.36	Oppose	<p>Considers that by deciding on 10 Minutes as the size of the Walking Catchment as measured from the edge of the Metropolitan MDRZ under the NPS-UD, the WCC officers are claiming Johnsonville residents within 15 minutes walking to facilities should be in the MDRZ and permitted for high density housing.</p> <p>Considers that the Johnsonville Walking Report report does not provide any evidence or justification that the residential areas beyond the Johnsonville MDRA 10 Minute Walking Catchment are now walking accessible when they were excluded from the WCC's own analysis in 2013. In its submission to the 2021 WCC Spatial Plan, the JCA requested the proposed MDRZ walking catchment be reduced from 10 minutes to 5 minutes from the edge of the Metropolitan Business Zone for this reason. This is based on a correct and complete application of the MfE Guidance on setting the Walking Catchments and on the WCC's previous evidence to the Environment Court that the current MDRA is the 10 Minute Walking Catchment for Johnsonville. Finally, when the council reduced the CBD walking catchment to 10 minutes from the CBD boundary, it retained the 10 minutes catchment for Johnsonville. Considers that this ignores MfE Guidance that "the centre's size can also affect the size of the catchment". Johnsonville is small for a Suburban Centre with a less employment than other "lesser" suburbs such as Newtown or Kilbirnie. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Disallow</p> <p>Seeks that the walking catchment from the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone is amended to 5 minutes (400m) from the edge of the Metropolitan Zone.</p>
								117.8	Oppose	Amendments to heights within walking catchments is opposed. These have already been extensively debated. Additional capacity is not needed and would cause significant impact on amenity.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Richard Tweedie	392.1	Support	<p>Supports that the walkable catchment for the Oriental Bay Precinct is 10 minutes.</p> <p>Anything longer does not reflect the reality of the weather, strong wind conditions, lack of shelter, and mainly elderly residents.</p>	Retain the walkable catchment for Oriental Bay Precinct as notified (10 minutes).	Reject – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ	Yes	131.43	Oppose	<p>Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delivered with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. 	Disallow

										[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	
								136.71	Oppose	<p>The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Disallow
								137.34	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p>	Disallow

										WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Murray Pillar	393.7	Support	Supports the Johnsonville Train Line not being classified as Rapid Transit.	Retain the Johnsonville Train Line as notified (not being classified as Rapid Transit).	Reject	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Murray Pillar	393.8	Support	Supports the smaller 10 minute walkable catchments around the CBD and metropolitan areas.	Retain the walkable catchments around centres as notified (10 minutes).	Accept in part – 10 minutes for MCZ, but 15 minutes for CCZ	Yes	69.79	Support	Boffa Miskell - adoption Boffa Miskell – support definitions and include all Add Character Precincts to areas missed 10min walkable catchment Character precincts and rules Character precincts for all sites identified by Boffa M. Establish Character Precincts where they were missed resource consents for demolishing pre-1930s dwellings	Allow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Murray Pillar	393.9	Support	Supports the smaller 10 minute walkable catchments around the main Kapiti train stations.	Retain the walkable catchments around the main Kapiti train stations as notified (10 minutes).	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.5	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments /	Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.6	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments –	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement						see report					
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.7	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that MRZ height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject	No	82.18	Oppose	Considers submissions are inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements; and no justification for enabling more intensive development in the MDRZ or around rail stations.	Disallow
								96.55	Oppose	Luke Stewart, Matthew Reweti, Miriam Moore, Patrick Wilkes, Svend Hansen – seeks that MDRZ height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments around all rail stations. Opposed where this is inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	David Cadman	398.4	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	131.27	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
								136.8	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling,	Allow

									<p>supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
							136.55	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
							137.10	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to</p>	Allow

										<p>walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	David Cadman	398.5	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	David Cadman	398.6	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that MRZ height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Ministry of Education	400.11	Support	Submitter notes that Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes educational facilities) is provided in urban growth and development areas. [see original submission for full reason].	Seeks enabling provisions for educational facilities in the relevant zones and relevant policy framework to achieve this outcome.	Addressed in stream 2 and 4		NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Investore Property Limited	405.18	Support	Supports the creation of well-functioning urban environments (consistent with the direction set out in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS- UD).	Not specified.	accept		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Investore Property Limited	405.19	Support	Supports the provision of six storey residential development in the wider Johnsonville catchment.	Not specified.	Accept in part – recommend 6 stories enabled within its 10 minute MCZ walkable catchment	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Investore Property Limited	405.20	Support	Supports the strategic direction set out by the NPS-UD, and its recognition of the role that Metropolitan Centres play in creating a well-functioning urban environment. The submitter's feedback on the provisions seeks to ensure that the rules and standards in the District Plan enable this outcome, particularly in respect of the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre.	Retain the strategic direction as notified. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part	no	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Investore Property Limited	405.21	Oppose	Considers that the exclusion of the Johnsonville rail line from "rapid transit" is inappropriate and inconsistent with the NPS-UD, Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan and Change 1 to the Wellington Regional Policy Statement.	Opposes exclusion of Johnsonville rail line from "rapid transit and seeks amendment the proposed District Plan to include the Johnsonville train line as a rapid transit and subject to Policy 3 of the NPS- UD.	Accept	Yes	114.2	Oppose	The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be "frequent" and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services. Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi. In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service. Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the	Disallow Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).

										<p>Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Investore Property Limited	405.22	Amend	<p>Considers that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as rapid transit and as such apply full NPS-UD provisions.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Seeks that the Johnsonville Rail Line be classified as a mass rapid transit line for the purposes of implementing policy 3 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.</p>	Accept	Yes	114.3	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Disallow</p> <p>Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).</p>
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments /	Investore Property Limited	405.23	Amend	<p>Considers that the current zoning disregards the NPS-UD direction. The Johnsonville Line should be classified as rapid transit and as such it should apply full NPS-UD zoning (six-storey).</p>	<p>Rezone the Johnsonville line from MRZ to HRZ and provide building heights of at least six storeys</p>	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	114.24	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p>	<p>Disallow</p> <p>Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).</p>

National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement				[Refer to original submission for full reason].	within a 10-minute walkable catchment of the stations on the Johnsonville Rail Line. [Inferred decision requested]					<p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.20	Amend	<p>Considers that the Proposed Plan should recognise rail as a qualifying matter. KiwiRail seeks that the railway corridor be identified as a qualifying matter and be applied to impose building setback requirements from the rail boundary as it is critical that the Proposed Plan provides for adequate management of the interface between urban development and lawfully established, critical infrastructure, such as the railway network. This is necessary to ensure our communities are built in healthy living environments, and the railway network can operate and develop in the future without constraint. An integrated and proactive approach to planning is critical to support the overall vision of our urban environments, and to ensure that our transport network can support the increasing growth and housing intensification.</p> <p>The nature of railway operations means KiwiRail cannot fully internalise all its effects within the</p>	<p>Seeks that the rail corridor be identified as a qualifying matter to incorporate provisions which are necessary for the safe and efficient operation of the rail corridor. Specifically, this qualifying matter needs to be applied in the Proposed Plan to require a "no-build" setback within 5m of the railway corridor for new buildings or structures in all relevant zones adjacent to the railway.</p>	Reject	no	89.29	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes the requested 5m setback; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners.</p>	Disallow
						This matter will also be addressed in stream 2		80.46	Support	<p>Supports the rail corridor being identified as a qualifying matter to incorporate provisions which are necessary for the safe and efficient operation of the rail corridor. Considers that, specifically, this qualifying matter needs to be applied in the Proposed Plan to require a "no-build" setback within 5m of the railway corridor for new buildings or structures in all relevant zones adjacent to the railway.</p>	Allow Seeks to incorporate changes as outlined by the submitter.

				<p>railway corridor boundaries. Environmental legislation and caselaw recognises the lawful emission of such effects. Increasing development around railway corridors consequentially means the introduction of more sensitive receivers to adverse effects of existing and lawful railway activities. With a likely increase in sensitive activities forecast to locate in proximity to the railway corridor as a result of the Amendment Act, KiwiRail is concerned that without appropriate planning measures in place at a territorial level, the risk of adverse health and amenity effects impacting people locating in proximity to the railway corridor, and reverse sensitivity effects constraining our operations is significantly elevated.</p> <p>For this reason, it is essential that the Proposed Plan appropriately manages the development of new sensitive activities in proximity to the railway corridor.</p> <p>The two primary ways which KiwiRail seeks to manage this interface is through the inclusion of the following controls in district plans:</p> <p>a. noise and vibration controls – requiring acoustic insulation and ventilation to be installed in new (or altered) sensitive uses within 100m of the railway corridor. Within 60m of the railway corridor, controls are sought that buildings containing new (or altered) sensitive uses are constructed to manage the impacts of vibration. These controls are important to ensure new development is undertaken in a way that achieves a healthy living environment for people locating within proximity to the railway corridor, minimising the potential for complaints about the effects of the railway network; and</p> <p>boundary setbacks – requiring a "no-build" setback within 5m of the railway corridor for new buildings or structures on sites adjoining the railway corridor. This is to ensure that people can use and maintain their land and buildings safely without needing to extend out into the railway corridor, minimising the risks of physical interference on railway operations and health and safety hazards on these residents.</p>							
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.21	Support in part	Supports urban development, including around transport nodes, and recognises the benefits of co-locating housing near transport corridors.	Not specified.	Accept.	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement											
National Direction Instruments	Emma Osborne	410.4	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	3.16	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement								131.26	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
								136.10	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. 	Allow

										<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
								136.54	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								137.13	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer</p>	Allow

										to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation. WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Emma Osborne	410.5	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	3.17	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	VicLabour	414.13	Oppose	Opposes decision that was made removing the designation of the Johnsonville line as rapid transit, thus leading it to have lesser densification. Considers that rapid transit should not be determined by the speed of which a train goes or how fast it goes along a track, but rather how long it would take for someone to get from their place of work to their home and that at 23mins from Johnsonville station to Wellington Station that this is a quick and efficient service. Considers that this journey and service will likely be quicker than light rail which will be built in the future and classified as rapid transit. Considers it incorrect that investment in the rail line will not increase in the future given the government’s increased funding in recent years. Considers that all suburban areas, particularly those connected by public transport be densified such as along the Johnsonville line, and that not doing so will increase the cost of housing	Seeks that the Johnsonville train line be identified as a rapid transit service and increased housing density enabled.	Accept	Yes	82.13	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are “planned” in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of “planned” in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	Disallow
								114.28	Oppose	The UPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services. Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi. In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The	Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).

				[Refer to original submission for full reasons]					Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service. Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]		
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	VicLabour	414.14	Oppose	Opposes decisions made to reduce the extent of walking catchments where higher density development is enabled and notified extent of the City Centre Zone walking catchment.	Seeks that the walking catchment around the edge of the city centre zone where high density development is enabled be increased to 20 minutes from the edge of the city centre zone.	Accept in part – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ.	Yes	82.46	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
				Considers that Wellington is known to be the city in which you can walk everywhere.				96.80	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
				Considers that a greater walking catchments should be enabled around the city centre as people living in these areas only have one 'leg' of a journey to complete, compared to those who need to use a rapid transit service. Considers that because transport choices are changing (eg e-scooters and ebikes) people are prepared to travel further to train and bus stations. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]				130.8	Oppose	Walk catchments at 15 minutes are already in excess of that required. A walk catchment of 10 minutes is sufficient and is more equitable to the broad and varied range of people with different needs and abilities in a community. Walk catchments are intended as a planning tool for access to specific destinations such as a public transport stop. They are not intended as a general tool to an ‘inner city’ zone which may not have any of the everyday services needed, for instance access to a fresh food outlet. 10 minutes walk at an average speed is slightly less than one kilometre for a fit healthy adult. It does not encompass all the community and says nothing about the amenity, service levels or attractiveness of the walk environment. Research shows that a best practice environment (such as following all the requirements in the NZ	Disallow Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to a more equitable 10 minutes.

										Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide/ Pedestrian Network Guidance) makes it easier for most people to walk further. A walkable catchment does not of itself provide this. Other provision to ensure this best practice must be embedded in the PDP.	
								131.48	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre whih will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								136.76	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not 	Allow

									support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].		
								137.40	Support	Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation. WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Allow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	VicLabour	414.15	Oppose	Opposes decisions made to reduce the extent of walking catchments where higher density development is enabled and notified extent of the Metropolitan Centre Zone walking catchment. Considers that Wellington is known to be the city in which you can walk everywhere. Considers that because transport choices are changing (eg e-scooters and ebikes) people are prepared to travel further to train and bus stations. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the walking catchment around the edge of the metropolitan centre zone where high density development is enabled be increased to 20 minutes from the edge of the city centre zone.	Accept in part – recommend 10 minutes for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this), no change to Johnsonville MCZ, and 15 minutes from CCZ	Yes	82.47	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								96.81	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Oppose

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	VicLabour	414.16	Amend	Opposes decisions made to reduce the extent of walking catchments where higher density development is enabled and notified extent of the Metropolitan Centre Zone walking catchment. Considers that Wellington is known to be the city in which you can walk everywhere. Considers that because transport choices are changing (eg e-scooters and ebikes) people are prepared to travel further to train and bus stations. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the walking catchment around the edge of the metropolitan centre zone where high density development is enabled be increased to 20 minutes from the edge of the city centre zone.	Accept in part – recommend 10 minutes for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this), no change to Johnsonville MCZ, and 15 minutes from CCZ	Yes	82.48	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								96.82	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	VicLabour	414.17	Oppose	Opposes decisions made to reduce the extent of walking catchments where higher density development is enabled and notified extent of rapid transit stop walking catchments. Considers that Wellington is known to be the city in which you can walk everywhere. Considers that because transport choices are changing (eg e-scooters and ebikes) people are prepared to travel further to train and bus stations. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the walking catchment around rapid transit stops where high density development is enabled be increased to 15 minutes.	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	82.49	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								96.83	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	VicLabour	414.18	Amend	Opposes decisions made to reduce the extent of walking catchments where higher density development is enabled and notified extent of rapid transit stop walking catchments. Considers that Wellington is known to be the city in which you can walk everywhere. Considers that because transport choices are changing (eg e-scooters and ebikes) people are prepared to travel further to train and bus stations. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the walking catchment around rapid transit stops where high density development is enabled be increased to 15 minutes.	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	82.50	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								96.84	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Sarah Cutten and Matthew Keir	415.3	Oppose	Considers that placing restrictive heritage listings on an isolated home that does not stand out from others on the street, is outside of any heritage areas and is not publically accessible is directly at odds to the objectives of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and District Plan to improve the efficient use of land and housing supply within walking distance from the CBD. [Refer to original submission for full reasons, including attachments].	Not specified.	Addressed in stream 3		16.2	Support	The constraints of scheduling seem contrary to the intent of the NPS-UD.	Allow Seeks that 28 Robieson Street be wholly removed from Schedule 1 ‘Heritage Buildings’.

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.10	Oppose	The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) requires district plans to enable building heights of at least 6 storeys within at least a walkable catchment of the edge of metropolitan centre zones (Policy 3(c)).	Opposes that the areas surrounding the Kilbirnie Metropolitan Centre Zone are not included within the High Density Residential Zone (in a similar way to the inclusion of areas surrounding the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone and within Newtown).	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.11	Amend	The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) requires district plans to enable building heights of at least 6 storeys within at least a walkable catchment of the edge of metropolitan centre zones (Policy 3(c)).	Seeks that the areas surrounding the Kilbirnie Metropolitan Centre Zone be included within the High Density Residential Zone (in a similar way to the inclusion of areas surrounding the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone and within Newtown).	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Penny Griffith	418.4	Support	Supports walking catchments being 10 minutes. Considers that this makes good practical sense for Wellington's topography, particularly around the CBD.	Retain Walking Catchments as notified (At 10 minutes).	Accept in part. Recommend 10 minutes for Johnsonville MCZ, 10 minutes for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this), 15 minutes from CCZ, and increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments from rapid transit stops – see report	Yes	131.8	Oppose	Opposes decreasing walking catchments to 10 minutes or below for the following reasons: - Housing supply, affordability, and the survival of youth in Wellington. - Trying to enter the housing market as a youth is becoming an unattainable dream and youth may choose to leave the city. - The capacity for intensification shrinks with reduced walking catchments. - Liveable cities will not be delivered with smaller walking catchments. - A range of homes are needed in places where people want to work and play, youth must not be priced out of prime city locations. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow
								136.35	Oppose	The submitter opposes the original submission to keep walking catchments at 10 minutes for the following reasons: - This is not within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around	Disallow

										<p>city centres.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
								137.30	Oppose	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Josephine Smith	419.10	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellingtons livability, character and heritage can be protected at the same time as new housing is added.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>Seeks that the interpretation of 'Character' takes a comprehensive, holistic definition of character as a qualifying matter.</p>	Addressed in Stream 2		NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	The Urban Activation Lab of Red Design Architects	420.11	Not specified	Considers that the NPS-UD requirements for maximising development is incompatible with some of the strategic objectives of the PDP expressed in the section on Urban Form and Development and in RMA Schedule 3A Clause 6. [See original submission for full reasons]	Not specified.	Reject	no	111.58	Support	HPW supports the implementation of a sensible plan for revitalisation in Newtown heritage shopping area including provision of additional housing at scale, while also protecting the heritage shop frontages. Considers that this plan retains heritage features (important for stepping back taller buildings from the narrow street to retain street level public amenity) but allows for desirable intensification.	Allow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Luke Stewart	422.1	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	131.16	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
								136.30	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking	Allow

										<p>catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
								136.43	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								137.43	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs</p>	Allow

										where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation. WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Luke Stewart	422.2	Not specified	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Luke Stewart	422.3	Amend	Considers that the plan should enable larger more comprehensive developments in centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject	No	82.17	Oppose	Considers submissions are inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements; and no justification for enabling more intensive development in the MDRZ or around rail stations.	Disallow
								96.54	Oppose	Luke Stewart, Matthew Reweti, Miriam Moore, Patrick Wilkes, Svend Hansen — seeks that MDRZ height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments around all rail stations. Opposed where this is inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Paul Gregory Rutherford	424.11	Amend	Considers that Wellingtons livability, character and heritage can be protected at the same time as new housing is added. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the interpretation of 'Character' takes a comprehensive, holistic definition of character as a qualifying matter.	Addressed in Stream 2		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal	Johnsonville Community Association	429.17	Support	Considers that all international best-practice points to more and higher density residential developments within walking distance of the city. This should be expanded in Wellington to allow the highest possible residential intensity in areas within a 10- minute walking distance of the city's two biggest employers, Wellington Hospital	Seeks that there are building heights of at least 6 storeys within a 10 minute walkable catchment of Wellington Hospital.	Reject this method, although the recommended 15 minute catchment from CCZ will achieve this point	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

Policy Statement				(Newtown) and Victoria University (Kelburn campus).							
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Johnsonville Community Association	429.18	Support	Considers that all international best-practice points to more and higher density residential developments within walking distance of the city. This should be expanded in Wellington to allow the highest possible residential intensity in areas within a 10- minute walking distance of the city's two biggest employers, Wellington Hospital (Newtown) and Victoria University (Kelburn campus).	Seeks the highest possible residential intensity in areas within a 10 minute walking distance of the City's two biggest employers, Wellington Hospital (Newtown) and Victoria University (Kelburn Campus).	Reject this method, although for Hospital, and partly for VUW, the recommended 15 minute catchment from CCZ will help achieve these points – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Johnsonville Community Association	429.19	Amend	GWRC does not hold any specific criteria for MRT services under which the Johnsonville Line would be deemed "Mass Rapid Transit" The NPS-UD says that for a public transport service to be rapid transit, it must be "frequent". However the One Network Framework (ONF) directly contradicts the NPS- UD definition when it states that all metro rail lines are rapid transit "irrespective of frequency". Auckland Council haven't used this framework resulting in the Onehunga Line not being defined as rapid transit under their transport plan. On this basis the Johnsonville Line would also not be deemed rapid transit if it were in Auckland or in any other country in the world. It's not rapid transit and any claim it is, is simply a lie based on no evidence. [See original submission pages 13 - 16 for full reason]	Seeks that WCC asks the Greater Wellington Regional Council to review its use of the One Network Framework as the basis for determining which public transport services are rapid transit under the NPS-UD.	Reject Out of PDP scope See body of report.	N/A	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Johnsonville Community Association	429.20	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested]	Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).	Reject	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Johnsonville Community Association	429.21	Not specified	Considers that expanding the Johnsonville MDRZ Walking catchment is not justified. The draft District Plan ignored the Medium Density Residential Area walking catchment in favour of a larger 10 Minute Walking Catchment in the MDRZ based on "Sophisticated computer modelling analysis" The MDRA based walking catchment on the	Not specified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				Johnsonville Triangle of Moorefield Road, Broderick Road, and Johnsonville Road. Where as NPS-UD requires walkable catchment from edge of Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone. But this still doesn't answer why the walking catchment is not 5 minutes walking from the edge, which better aligns with 10 minute walking from "Local facilities". Considers that the Proposed District Plan ignored NPS-UD direction in provision 5.5.3. [See original submission for full reason]							
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Johnsonville Community Association	429.22	Amend	Considers that Johnsonville, despite being much smaller than the CBD, has the same size catchment. MfE Guidance says that the centres size can also affect the size of the catchment. The catchment is effectively 15 minutes to the actual facilities in the MCZ because there aren't many facilities at the edge of the MCZ. A 5 minute walking catchment from edge of MCZ is more in line with the 10 minute walking catchment to the facilities. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the walking catchment from the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone is amended to 5 minutes.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Johnsonville Community Association	429.23	Support	Considers that Johnsonville Line stations are not rapid transit. The Johnsonville Line is not fast, infrequent and not high capacity. [See original submission for full reason]	Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).	Reject	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Garvin Wong	432.2	Amend	Considers that Character Precincts should not be a qualifying matter to give property owners the flexibility to upgrade/rebuild houses without needing resource consents.	Seeks that Character Precincts be removed from qualifying matters.	Reject	No	69.38	Oppose	WCC Summary reads: Considers that Character Precincts should not be a qualifying matter. Seeks that the extent of Character Precincts be amended to remove properties in Thorndon.	Disallow
								82.51	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								82.56	Oppose	Considers Thorndon character precincts protect significant heritage and character values.	Disallow

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Miriam Moore	433.4	Oppose	Considers that the mapping should be amended to reflect a 15 minute walkable catchment around train stations.	Amend the high density zoning and around all train stations to cover at least the area within a 15 minute walkable catchment	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	96.56	Oppose	Luke Stewart, Matthew Reweti, Miriam Moore, Patrick Wilkes, Svend Hansen – seeks that MDRZ height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments around all rail stations. Opposed where this is inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Miriam Moore	433.7	Amend	Considers that the walking catchment should be increased to 15 minutes for all train stops. All stops on the Kāpiti Line should be 15 minutes to keep the line consistent with the stops outside of the Wellington jurisdiction.	Seeks to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for all train stops.	Accept in part – recommend increases to 10 minute catchments for all Kapiti Line stops	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Miriam Moore	433.8	Amend	Considers that the walking catchment should be increased to 15 minutes around the City Centre Zone. Notes that Wellington is known for high active transport and a walking time of 15 minutes is appropriate for this zone.	Seeks to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes around the City Centre Zone.	Accept	Yes	131.1	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Miriam Moore	433.9	Amend	Considers that the walking catchment should be increased to 15 minutes around the Metropolitan Centre Zones. Notes that Wellington is known for high active transport and a walking time of 15 minutes is appropriate for this zone.	Seeks to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes around the Metropolitan Centre Zone.	Accept in part – recommend 10 minutes new catchment for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this)	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Miriam Moore	433.10	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Line should be reinstated as a MRT route. While acknowledging it is not as fast as the bus, train travel is more appealing to many users (particularly given its better accessibility for families, wheelchairs, pushchairs and bikes to use it). More housing along more accessible routes is essential in Wellington where terrain is a constant challenge to accessibility. Public transport users are likely to walk further for trains, and having an efficient bus service as a faster option should not lessen a train line's suitability as an MRT line, but enhance it.	Seeks to include the Johnsonville line as a Mass Rapid Transit route.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Anna Kemble Welch	434.5	Support in part	Supports the Council using character as a Qualifying Matter to modify the permitted building heights and other matters that would be required under the NPS-UD 2020 or the MDRS.	Retain Character as a Qualifying Matter in the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter.	Addressed in Stream 2		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Michelle Rush	436.9	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Line should be identified as a rapid transit line. It is noted the line is noted as such in the GWRC Regional Land Transport Plan, fits well within the definition of rapid transit in the NPS-UD, and has many areas along it that could be densified. These suburbs have a high level of servicing with amenities, facilities and services within walking distance of the train catchment. If WCC is to meet its carbon reduction targets; reduce congestion; improve liveability through enabling more people to live in suburbs with high levels of amenities, it is essential the Johnsonville Rail Line is recognised as a high capacity route that meets 'rapid' transit criterium. The line runs at 12 minutes at peak times, and has capacity to increase this frequency into the future through the addition of further loops.	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as a Mass Rapid Transit Line.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Michelle Rush	436.10	Amend	Considers that rapid transit stops provisions in the plan should be amended to clarify which stations are rapid transit stops and include stops missing from the Johnsonville Line and Kapiti Line. The Kaiwharawhara station should be included in the Kapiti Line, as whilst currently unused, the NPS-UD references future transport routes as well as current. This station, which could be easily reinstated, is in an area increasingly important for both commercial and industrial activities, and	Seeks that all rapid transit stops in Wellington be explicitly stated to users as follows: The following stations on the Kapiti Line are rapid transit stops: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wellington Station Kaiwharawhara Station* currently in abeyance Takapu Road Station Redwood Station 	Accept in part. Agree that rapid transit stops should be listed, but not Kaiwharawhara Station (and also should not be upzoned under NPS-UD) because people	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA

				housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tawa Station • Linden Station • Kenepuru Station <p>The following stations on the Johnsonville Line are rapid transit stops:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crofton Downs Station • Ngaio Station • Awarua Street Station • Simla Crescent Station • Box Hill Station • Khandallah Station • Raroa Station • Johnsonville Station <p>The following station on the Hutt/Melling Line is a rapid transit stop: Ngauranga Station.</p>	cannot enter and exit rapid transit services at this point. Also need to note that Kenepuru Station is outside Wellington City, but part of its walkable catchment is inside the City boundary. The text requested can be simplified and clarified as in the Hearing Report. See body of report.					
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Newtown Residents' Association	440.9	Amend	Considers that walking catchments should be further reduced. In particular the zoning of several blocks around the Newtown suburban centre for heights of up to 21m seems unnecessary and counter productive to maintaining a well functioning urban environment.	Seeks that walking catchments are reduced.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Newtown Residents' Association	440.10	Amend	Considers that the damaging environmental effects of high rise developments in established low rise communities should be considered a 'qualifying matter' for modifying building heights and encouraging retention and adaptation of existing housing stock, under NPS-UD clause 3.32 (1) (h). (Option A)	Seeks that negative environmental effects of high rise development be considered a Qualifying matter under the NPS-UD.	Reject	no	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Chrissie Potter	446.1	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (MRZ) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.	Addressed in Stream 4		NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Dorothy Thompson	449.1	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 “height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters”.	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (Medium Density Residential Zone) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.	Addressed in Stream 4		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	John Wilson	453.6	Oppose	Opposes the provisions in the Plan applying to the “Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone” and also to the “Kenepuru and Tawa railway stations Zone/Zones”.	Not specified.	Addressed in Stream 4		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	John Wilson	453.7	Amend	Considers that the extent of the zones should be clearly defined, e.g. by lines on a map. If defined by distance from the centre point, this should be defined in terms of distance from the centre point. Not in terms of time eg say five or ten minutes walk from the centre of the zone as this requires a subjective interpretation of how far and how fast a typical pedestrian could walk.	Seeks to clarify how zones are defined in terms of distance from the centre point compared to time in minutes walked. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – include definition of walkable catchment to help with this – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	John Wilson	453.8	Not specified	Further clarification is requested of Rapid Transport lines/stops. Questions why other railway stations not included, say Redwood or Takapu Road or Linden or even perhaps other stations on the Johnsonville Line or Ngauranga railway station.	Seeks to clarify what railway stops are considered Rapid Transport. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept the request to include a definition of rapid transit that states which services meet the definition. See body of report.	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.16	Amend	Considers that the NPS-UD is divorced from actual need because it requires councils to deliver a great deal of new development capacity all at once above the amount required at the time. This includes raising height limits irrespective of need. [See original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Council devises a series of Qualifying Matters that filter NPS-UD requirements through prioritising multiple attributes of the urban environment that the community wants to retain, including holding height limits at a level the community seeks for each suburb or area.	Reject	no	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Rachel Leilani	464.1	Amend	Considers that the smaller 10 minute walkable catchment from the city centre from the draft District Plan would have no benefits and shift development to less well suited areas.	Amend the high density zoning and around the city centre to cover at least the area within a 15 minute walkable catchment (rather than the current 10	Accept	Yes	96.78	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of	Disallow

					minute catchment)					Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Rachel Leilani	464.2	Amend	Considers that the smaller 10 minute walkable catchment from the city centre from the draft District Plan would have no benefits and shift development to less well-suited areas.	Amend the walkable catchment to a 15 minute walkable catchment (rather than the current 10 minute catchment).	Accept	Yes	136.80	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
								137.29	Support	Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples’ inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more	Allow

										environmentally friendly modes of transportation. WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Daniel Christopher Murray Grantham	468.1	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased . [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	131.30	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow
								136.2	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments.	Allow

										<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
								136.58	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								137.7	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in</p>	Allow

										<p>Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Daniel Christopher Murray Grantham	468.2	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased to a 15 minute walking catchment. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Stride Investment Management Limited	470.5	Support	Supports the strategic direction set by the NPS-UD, and its recognition of the role that Metropolitan Centres play in creating a well functioning urban environment. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	Addressed in stream 4		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Stride Investment Management Limited	470.6	Oppose	Opposes the exclusion of the Johnsonville Rail Line as 'rapid transit', for the purposes of implementing Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Opposes exclusion of the Johnsonville Rail Line as 'rapid transit as notified, seeks amendments.	Accept	Yes	80.50	Oppose	Opposes the Stride submission that the Johnsonville Rail Line is designated as a rapid transit stop and considers that Stride provides no justification for this and may be gaining competitive advantage through their submission and considers they have used none of their recent resource consents to create the better centre the community needs [Inferred reference to submission point 470.6]	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments /	Stride Investment Management Limited	470.7	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville rail line meets the definition of 'rapid transit service' in the NPS-UD as it has a peak time frequency of 15 minutes and is identified as planned rapid transit in the Wellington Regional Land	Seeks that the Johnsonville rail line is included as rapid transit for the purposes of implementing policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Accept	Yes	80.51	Oppose	Opposes the Stride submission that the Johnsonville Rail Line is designated as a rapid transit stop and considers that Stride provides no justification for this and may be gaining competitive advantage through their submission and considers they have used none of their recent	Disallow

National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement				Transport Plan 2021.						resource consents to create the better centre the community needs [Inferred reference to submission point 470.7]	
									114.29	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New	Stride Investment Management Limited	470.8	Amend	Considers all stations on the Johnsonville Rail Line should be included as rapid transit stops and that building heights of at least six storeys within a 10-minute walking catchment is provided.	Seeks that building heights of at least six storeys within a 10-minute walkable catchment of the stations on the Johnsonville rail line.	Accept in part – recommend 5 and 10 minute catchments for Johnsonville Line stations – see report	Yes	80.52	Oppose	Opposes the Stride submission that the Johnsonville Rail Line is designated as a rapid transit stop and considers that Stride provides no justification for this and may be gaining competitive advantage through their submission and considers they have used none of their recent resource consents to create the better centre the community needs [Inferred reference to submission point 470.8]	Disallow

Zealand Coastal Policy Statement								114.30	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be “frequent” and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.5	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	131.9	Support	<p>Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre whih will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. 	Allow

									<p>- Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>		
								136.31	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	Allow
								136.36	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the 	Allow

										<p>walking catchments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.6	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.7	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments for rapid transit stops, adding Kilbirnie MCZ catchment (or future plan change for this) and 15 minutes from CCZ – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.8	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that there are larger walking catchments for intensification around centres and mass transit hubs. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments for rapid transit stops, adding Kilbirnie MCZ catchment (or future plan change for this) and 15 minutes from CCZ – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Christina Mackay	478.5	Support	Submitter supports the proposed application of a qualifying matter to exempt from intensification, sites in the proposed Character Precincts.	Supports the proposed application of a qualifying matter to exempt from intensification, sites in the proposed Character Precincts.	Addressed in stream 2		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Elayna Chhiba	480.1	Amend	Considers that reducing Wellington City's walkable catchment to 10 minutes may work against having affordable housing supply around the city. It is already difficult for the young generation to save up to buy a house anywhere near Wellington City or rent a house of an adequate standard. Considers that even 15min walking is only 5mins on a scooter [see original submission for full reasons]	Amend the walkable catchment from the edge of the City Centre Zone to be well over 10-minutes.	Accept in part – recommend 15 minutes from CCZ	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.27	Not specified	Considers that what is in practice walkable depends on the street design. To achieve the spirit of the NPS-UD, improvements are needed to make highly walkable catchments, particularly around town centres and transit stops. [See original submission for full reasons and suggestions].	Seeks that improvements are made to make highly walkable catchments particularly around town centre and transit stops. [Refer to original submission for full details of suggestions for walkable catchments].	Addressed in stream 9		NA	NA	NA	NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Escape Investments Limited	484.2	Amend	Considers that the high density residential zoning walkable catchment for the City Centre should revert back to 15 minutes in line with the NPS-UD objectives. Auckland has adopted a 15 minute walkable catchment. WCC reducing the walkable catchment size creates issues around less potential supply surrounding the CCZ, essential and service industry workers priced out of the city, and is unsupportive of the climate. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that the walkable catchment for the City Centre should be increased to 15 minutes.	Accept	Yes	3.19	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington's demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
								37.21	Oppose	Considers that a limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for eg in Hay Street).	Disallow
								38.23	Oppose	Opposes those parts of Escape Investments Ltd's submission that seeks to extend the walkable catchment above 10 minutes.	Disallow
								62.21	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
								94.21	Oppose	Reasons for opposing extension of walkable catchment beyond 10 mins are set out above in relation to Property Council : Considers that a limit of ten minutes on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington, and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather	Disallow

										and steep topography of Wellington. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last five minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for Wilkinson Street). People's propensity to walk decreases with distance.	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.10	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Line should be identified as a rapid transit line and concerned at the impact that the lack of identification will create in the future and justify expansion of cities to more greenfield development and further impact on the environment.	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line should be classified as a Mass Rapid Transit Line. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	Yes	82.11	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are "planned" in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	Disallow
								114.32	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be "frequent" and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services.</p> <p>Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi.</p> <p>In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service.</p> <p>Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as not being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit.</p> <p>Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Disallow</p> <p>Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).</p>

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Jonathan Markwick	490.8	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around centres.	Seeks that walking catchments around centres are increased.	Accept in part - recommended for Kilbirnie MCZ (or future plan change for this) and CCZ	Yes	3.29	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
								62.31	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
								82.37	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								96.71	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								130.5	Oppose	Walk catchments at 15 minutes are already in excess of that required. A walk catchment of 10 minutes is sufficient and is more equitable to the broad and varied range of people with different needs and abilities in a community. Walk catchments are intended as a planning tool for access to specific destinations such as a public transport stop. They are not intended as a general tool to an ‘inner city’ zone which may not have any of the everyday services needed, for instance access to a fresh food outlet. 10 minutes walk at an average speed is slightly less than one kilometre for a fit healthy adult. It does not encompass all the community and says nothing about the amenity, service levels or attractiveness of the walk environment. Research shows that a best practice environment (such as following all the requirements in the NZ Pedestrian Planning and Design Guide/ Pedestrian Network Guidance) makes it easier for most people to walk further. A walkable catchment does not of itself provide this. Other provision to ensure this best practice must be embedded in the PDP.	Disallow Seeks that the walkable catchment is retained at 15 minutes or reduced to a more equitable 10 minutes.
136.5	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new	Allow								

									<p>housing in Oriental Bay.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning].</p>	
							137.8	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation.</p> <p>WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS-UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Allow

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Jonathan Markwick	490.9	Amend	Supports larger walking catchments for intensification around mass transit hubs.	Seeks that walking catchments around mass transit hubs are increased.	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments – see report	Yes	3.30	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
								62.32	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
								82.38	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								96.72	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								136.39	Support	The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons: - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning morfe people will move to outer suburbs. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow

Appendix B – National Direction Instruments

National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Jonathan Markwick	490.10	Amend	Supports the NPS-UD 15 minute walkable catchment around the city centre.	Seeks that the walkable catchment around the city centre is increased to 15 minutes.	Accept	Yes	3.31	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture. In particular the weather and wind conditions on Oriental Parade often make walking difficult for residents.	Disallow
								94.23	Oppose	Considers that qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA relating to the specific characteristics of Wilkinson Street, particularly its steepness, narrowness, and potentially hazardous nature which make high density intensification inappropriate. Also Don MacKay repeat comments made above in relation to Property Council re their opposition to extension of the walkable catchment.	Disallow
								37.23	Oppose	Considers that qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA relating to the specific characteristics of Hay St. Submitters repeats comments made above in relation to Property Council re their opposition to extension of the walkable catchment. Considers that a limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People’s propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for eg in Hay Street).	Disallow
								38.21	Oppose	Opposes those parts of Jonathon Markwick’s submission that seeks to extend the walkable catchment above 10 minutes.	Disallow
								62.33	Oppose	10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Oriental Bay residents given exposed wind and weather conditions.	Disallow
								82.39	Oppose	Considers 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
								96.73	Oppose	We oppose the submission of Cameron Vannisselroy, Conor Hill, Generation Zero, Jonathan Markwick, Kainga Ora, Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington, Property Council New Zealand, Te Tūāpapa Kura Kāinga Ministry of Housing and Urban Development, VicLabour, Waka Kotahi, WCC Environmental Reference Group. 10 minutes is an appropriate walkable catchment for Wellington’s demographics, topography, climate and culture.	Disallow
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments /	Jonathan Markwick	490.11	Amend	Considers that the Johnsonville Line is Mass Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD	Seeks that the Johnsonville Line is classified as Rapid Transit and accordingly has 6 storey buildings enabled within a walking catchment of its stops.	Accept	Yes	82.8	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are “planned” in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in	Disallow

National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement											the RLTP. Considers the definition of “planned” in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Jonathan Markwick	490.12	Amend	<p>Considers that the Johnsonville Line is Mass Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD and should enable six storey high density residential zoning within 15 minute walkable catchments.</p> <p>The Johnsonville Line is a fully separated right-of-way, free from congestion. Unlike the LGWM “Mass Rapid Transit” line the Johnsonville line is already in place, and more housing supply should be allowed now.</p>	Seeks that six storey high density residential zoning is allowed within 15 minute walkable catchments on stations along the Johnsonville Line.	Accept in part – recommend increases to 5 and 10 minute catchments around Johnsonville Line stations as rapid transit – see report	Yes	NA	NA	NA		NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Jonathan Markwick	490.13	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	<p>Seeks that the 10 or 15 minutes walkable catchments for six storey high density residential zoning be applied for all the Kapiti Line stops, including the entirety of:</p> <p>Taylor Terrace and its side streets; Oxford Street (Tawa); Findlay Street; Handyside Street; Redwood Avenue and McKeefy Grove; Sunrise Boulevard.</p>	Accept – recommend 10 minutes for Kapiti Line stations	Yes	NA	NA	NA		NA
National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Environmental Standards	Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.38	Support	Supports reference to the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities) Regulations 2009, noting the NES prevails over the district plan provisions.	Retain the reference to the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities) Regulations 2009.	Accept.	no	NA	NA	NA		NA

Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers' rec For reasons see body of report	Amendments to PDP?	Further Sub No / Point No	Position	Reasons for Support or Opposition	Decisions Requested
Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Melissa Harward	65.1	Support in part	Supports wording of Tangata Whenua chapter as it stands.	Retain Tangata Whenua chapter as notified.	Agree	No				
Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Melissa Harward	65.2	Amend	Considers that WCC should enable local Iwi to participate in all resource management decisions affecting land in Wellington.	Seeks that the scope of the Tangata Whenua chapter is expanded beyond the minimum required by Treaty Settlement legislation.	Reject	No				
Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Roland Sapsford	305.25	Support	Supports provisions which seek to enhance the mana of kaitiaki and to give effect at a local level to the solemn commitment to rangatiratanga contained in Te Tiriti o Waitangi	Retain Tangata Whenua chapter as notified [Inferred decision requested]	Agree	No				
Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.18	Support	Generally supports these provisions as drafted.	Retain "Tangata Whenua" section as notified.	Agree	No				
Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority Inc	379.1	Not specified	Considers that the iwi were not consulted under Clause 3(1)(d), 1st Schedule of the RMA 1991 in the preparation of the proposed plan.	Not specified.	Reject	No				
Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority Inc	379.2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Amend the Tangata Whenua chapter as follows: ... Mana Whenua and Resource Management ... Tangata Whenua interests with Treaty settlements within the Council jurisdiction are represented by: - Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust who represent Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika a Maui; and - Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira Incorporated who represent Ngāti Toa Rangatira. <u>Whātonga-descent peoples including Muaūpoko and Rangitane also have ancestral associations with Te Whanganui-a-Tara.</u> ...	Reject	No	FS138.28	Oppose	The submitter requests for the Tangata Whenua Chapter to be amended to refer to Ngāti Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui as Tangata Whenua with Treaty Settlements. They also request for both Muaūpoko and Rangitāne to be recognised in the Tangata Whenua Chapter as whātonga descent people with ancestral association throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because it is not appropriate to include Muaūpoko in the Tangata Whenua Chapter. This will cause confusion of the Tangata Whenua status in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and subsequent requirements for Council's and land users' engagement with Tangata Whenua on the land use and district plan related matters.	Disallow
Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority Inc	379.3	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Amend the Tangata Whenua chapter as follows: ... RECOGNITION OF IWI AND HAPU History of the Hapū and Iwi Within the Rohe	Reject	No	FS138.29	Oppose	The submitter requests for the Tangata Whenua Chapter to be amended to refer to Ngāti Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui as Tangata Whenua with Treaty Settlements. They also request for both Muaūpoko and Rangitāne to	Disallow

					<p>Whātonga-descent peoples Whātonga, rangatira of the Kurahaupo waka, explored the harbour and named it Te Whanganui-a-Tara after his son. Fortifications were built including Te Whetu-kairangi pa, on the then island of Miramar. Cultivations were established in the Seatoun Island Bay and Te Aro areas as well as at the harbour entrance. The harbour was thereafter settled by the descendants of Whātonga including Ngai Tara, Muaūpoko, Rangitane and Ngāti Apa.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui ...</p>					<p>be recognised in the Tangata Whenua Chapter as whātonga descent people with ancestral association throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because it is not appropriate to include Muaūpoko in the Tangata Whenua Chapter. This will cause confusion of the Tangata Whenua status in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and subsequent requirements for Council's and land users' engagement with Tangata Whenua on the land use and district plan related matters.</p>	
Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority Inc	379.4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	<p>Amend the Tangata Whenua chapter as follows: ...</p> <p>The Relationship of Hapū and Iwi with their Rohe / The Relationship of Hapū and Iwi with Ancestral Lands, Water, Sites, W āhi Tapu, and other Taonga, and interests in Resource Management</p> <p><u>Whātonga descent groups</u> <u>Ancestral</u> <u>connections with te</u> <u>Whanganui a Tara</u> <u>are important to</u> <u>these iwi.</u> Te Whanganui a Tara</p> <p>Te Whanganui a Tara (the Wellington Harbour) has always been of great importance to Māori since the arrival of Kupe many centuries ago when he named the Harbour islands Matiu and Makaro (after his daughters) and Mokopuna. Early <u>Whātonga and his descendants</u> Māori settled on the land around the Harbour, initially on Matiu and then Motu Kairangi (Watts Peninsula and Miramar). The Harbour has always provided a trade route, not only across Te Moana o Raukawa (the Cook Strait) but also up Te Awa Kairangi (The Hutt River), and its fish and shellfish species long supported iwi who used it as their food basket. ...</p>	Reject	No	FS138.30	oppose	<p>The submitter requests for the Tangata Whenua Chapter to be amended to refer to Ngāti Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui as Tangata Whenua with Treaty Settlements. They also request for both Muaūpoko and Rangitane to be recognised in the Tangata Whenua Chapter as whātonga descent people with ancestral association throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because it is not appropriate to include Muaūpoko in the Tangata Whenua Chapter. This will cause confusion of the Tangata Whenua status in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and subsequent requirements for Council's and land users' engagement with Tangata Whenua on the land use and district plan related matters.</p>	Disallow

Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority Inc	379.5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Amend the Tangata Whenua chapter as follows: ... ENVIRONMENTAL OUTCOMES <u>Whātonga descent peoples Reclaimed connections and protection of sites associated with past occupation are critical to maintain relationships with ancestral lands.</u>	Reject	No	FS138.31	Oppose	The submitter requests for the Tangata Whenua Chapter to be amended to refer to Ngāti Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui as Tangata Whenua with Treaty Settlements. They also request for both Muaūpoko and Rangitāne to be recognised in the Tangata Whenua Chapter as whātonga descent people with ancestral association throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because it is not appropriate to include Muaūpoko in the Tangata Whenua Chapter. This will cause confusion of the Tangata Whenua status in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and subsequent requirements for Council's and land users' engagement with Tangata Whenua on the land use and district plan related matters.	Disallow
Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority Inc	379.6	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Amend the Tangata Whenua chapter as follows: ... Description of Resources Significant to Tāngata Whenua / Mana Whenua <u>Whātonga descent peoples Many sites in the harbour are associated with descendants of Whātonga. These ancestral relationships need to be recognised. The layer of history of these descendants needs to be protected in developments.</u> Taranaki Whānui ...	Reject	No	FS138.32	Oppose	The submitter requests for the Tangata Whenua Chapter to be amended to refer to Ngāti Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui as Tangata Whenua with Treaty Settlements. They also request for both Muaūpoko and Rangitāne to be recognised in the Tangata Whenua Chapter as whātonga descent people with ancestral association throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because it is not appropriate to include Muaūpoko in the Tangata Whenua Chapter. This will cause confusion of the Tangata Whenua status in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and subsequent requirements for Council's and land users' engagement with Tangata Whenua on the land use and district plan related matters.	Disallow
Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority Inc	379.7	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Amend the Tangata Whenua chapter as follows: ... <u>Relevant Iwi Authorities with Treaty settlements</u> Taranaki Whānui	Reject	No	FS138.33		The submitter requests for the Tangata Whenua Chapter to be amended to refer to Ngāti Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui as Tangata Whenua with Treaty Settlements. They also request for both Muaūpoko and Rangitāne to be recognised in the Tangata Whenua Chapter as whātonga descent people with ancestral association throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because it is not appropriate to include Muaūpoko in the Tangata Whenua Chapter.	Disallow

											This will cause confusion of the Tangata Whenua status in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and subsequent requirements for Council's and land users' engagement with Tangata Whenua on the land use and district plan related matters.	
Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Muaūpoko Tribal Authority Inc	379.8	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Amend the Tangata Whenua chapter as follows: ... TANGATA WHENUA / MANA WHENUA – LOCAL AUTHORITY RELATIONSHIPS <u>Whātonga descent groups</u> <u>While there are at this time no formal Treaty settlements with Whātonga descent iwi covering Te Whanganui a Tara, the Council acknowledges the importance of reaching out to these groups where they may be affected by developments.</u> Taranaki Whānui ...	Reject	No	FS138.28	oppose	The submitter requests for the Tangata Whenua Chapter to be amended to refer to Ngāti Toa Rangatira and Taranaki Whānui as Tangata Whenua with Treaty Settlements. They also request for both Muaūpoko and Rangitāne to be recognised in the Tangata Whenua Chapter as whātonga descent people with ancestral association throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because it is not appropriate to include Muaūpoko in the Tangata Whenua Chapter. This will cause confusion of the Tangata Whenua status in Te Whanganui a Tara rohe and subsequent requirements for Council's and land users' engagement with Tangata Whenua on the land use and district plan related matters.	Disallow	
Tangata Whenua Subpart / Tangata Whenua / Tangata Whenua	Living Streets Aotearoa	482.26	Support	Supports the inclusion of a Tangata Whenua section setting out clearly the iwi that are man whenua and the settlement obligations.	Retain Tangata Whenua chapter as notified.	Agree	No					

Appendix B – Introduction

Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers' rec and reasons	Changes to PDP?	Further Sub No / Point No	Position	Reasons for Support or Opposition	Decisions Requested
Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Introduction General	John Tiley	142.4	Amend	Considers that while the description acknowledges the benefits derived from the Town Belt and the Outer Green Belt, no mention is included of ridgelines generally and how these, together with associated open slopes, contribute to visual amenity, a sense of community, and continuity of open space.	Seeks that ridgelines are acknowledged in the Introduction - Description of the District alongside the town belt and outer greenbelt.	Reject See body of report	No	83.73	Support	The submissions identify the need for greater clarity and better protection in the Plan for the city's identified ridgelines and hilltops. Wellington Civic Trust supports these points	Allow
					[Inferred decision requested].			86.26	Oppose	Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 142.4].	Allow
Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Introduction General	Churton Park Community Association	189.4	Amend	Considers that while the description acknowledges the benefits derived from the Town Belt and the Outer Green Belt, no mention is included of ridgelines generally and how these, together with associated open slopes, contribute to visual amenity, a sense of community, and continuity of open space.	Seeks that ridgelines are acknowledged in the Introduction - Description of the District alongside the townbelt and outer greenbelt. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject See body of report	No	86.37	Oppose	Supports Glenside Progressive Association's submission regarding the protection of Ridgelines citywide. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 189.4].	Allow
Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Introduction General	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.1	Support	Generally supports these provisions as drafted.	Retain "Introduction" section as notified.	Accept See body of report	No				
Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Description of the District	Wellington City Council	266.48	Amend	Considers the population projections should be updated to the most recent population forecasts.	Amend footnote reference as follows: Stats NZ (2018) New Zealand Census Sense Partners population forecasts for 2020 to 2051	Accept See body of report	Yes				
Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Description of the District	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.24	Amend	Considers that Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika holds ahi kā and primary mana whenua status across and throughout Wellington City. The Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust (PNBST) is the post-settlement governance entity for Taranaki Whānui, has the role to manage treaty settlement matters and is the iwi authority for resource management purposes.	Seeks that 'Description of the District' is amended to include the following: "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City."	Reject See body of report	No	2.6	Oppose	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. 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	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions relating to Shelly Bay in submission 389 are disallowed.

Appendix B – Introduction

										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.	
								40.6	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
								79.1	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whānui submission quotes its 29 March 2017 MOU with WCC that "As significant land owners at Shelly Bay, the parties recognise the importance of working together to ensure a wider strategic vision for the Miramar Peninsula is achieved for all citizens." Considers that this is misleading. Nine days after the MOU was signed (7 July 2017) Taranaki Whānui sold three of its four Shelly Bay blocks of land to The Wellington Company, with an option for TWC to buy the fourth and final block as well (which happened later).</p> <p>Considers that when Taranaki Whānui wrote Submission 389, it was no longer a "significant land owner at Shelly Bay". Considers that this is misleading the Proposed District Plan process. And in fact it was presumably already preparing to sell much of the land as it signed the WCC MOU.</p>	Disallow

Appendix B – Introduction

										Considers that this is relevant to the current Proposed District Plan process. Taranaki Whānui staff have repeatedly acted as supporters and proxies for The Wellington Company property developers in WCC and other processes relating to Shelly Bay. Buy Back the Bay notes that The Wellington Company is not participating in the district plan process. Considers that it appears that Taranaki Whānui is once more fronting for the company in at least many of their requests in Submission 389. Considers that if this is the case, Buy Back the Bay question whether Taranaki Whānui's special relationship with council should be used to assist a property developer.		
								79.4	Oppose	Submission 389 states as a Submission Point, that "Taranaki Whānui opposes the zoning and extent of overlays proposed over Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula, Mount Crawford." It lists the relevant PDP Chapter as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning maps • He Rohe Ahoaho Māori Natural Open Space Zone chapter • Ngā Wāhi Tapu ki te Māori Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter • Ngā Pūnaha Rauropi me te Kanorau Kōiora Taketake Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter • Te Ahurei o Ngā Hanga Māori Natural Character chapter • Ngā Hanga Māori me Ngā Nohopae Natural Features and Landscapes chapter • Wawaetanga Subdivision chapter • Taiao Takutai Coastal Environment chapter Opposes in total Submission 389 on these points, which appears to be a wholesale rejection of planning rules in these areas.	Disallow	
								138.37	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	
Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Description of the District	CentrePort Limited	402.2	Support in part	Support Description of the District in part. Submitter considers that there is no recognition of the role of the Port, the harbour or Wellingtons function as the North Island terminal for interisland freight and travel.	Support Description of the District with amendments.	Accept	No					See body of report

Appendix B – Introduction

Introduction Subpart / Introduction / Description of the District	CentrePort Limited	402.3	Amend	Submitter considers that there is no recognition of the role of the Port, the harbour or Wellingtons function as the North Island terminal for interisland freight and travel.	<p>Amend Description of the District as follows:</p> <p>... <u>Wellington provides the northern link for State Highway 1 and the main trunk railway between the North Island and the South Island.</u> <u>Wellington Harbour (Te Whanganui-a-Tara) is an important New Zealand port, for a range of exports and imports. Wellington Airport is the third biggest passenger airport in New Zealand.</u></p> <p>[Inferred decision sought] ... [Submitter seeks consistency with the Proposed Natural Resources Plan].</p>	Accept See body of report	Yes	44.1	Oppose	Guardians of the Bays Incorporated is not sure that the relevance to 'biggest' is required. It does not provide any information on what 'biggest' actually means e.g. size of land area, volume of aircraft movement, or number of passengers and freight?	Amend provision as follows: Wellington Airport is the third biggest passenger airport in New Zealand.
---	--------------------	-------	-------	--	--	----------------------------------	-----	------	--------	--	---

Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers' rec and reasons	Changes to PDP?	Further Sub No / Point No	Position	Reasons for Support or Opposition	Decisions Requested
How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / How the Plan Works General	Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.11	Amend	Supports the provided clarification in the IPI and PDP as to the legal effect of specific provisions. An amendment is sought to highlight to plan users the existence of qualifying matters and that if a development is located in an area where a qualifying matter applies, the MDRS does not have immediate legal effect. While submitter is aware the provision relating to legal effect and qualifying matters will technically not be required once the plan is made operative, considers that in the interim period it has concerns as to the lack of reference to qualifying matters and therefore supports any clarification that can be provided.	Amend the section Legal effect of rules, as follows: In addition, the District Plan gives effect to the 'Medium Density Residential Standards' (MDRS). The MDRS will replace the existing building standards in the residential zones (MRZ and HRZ) and set out the level of development that can occur on a site as a permitted activity. Specifically, MRZ-S1 to MRZ-S9 and HRZ-S1 to HRZ-S9 (excluding MRZ-S2 and HRZ-S2) have immediate legal effect, along with the related objectives, policies and rules, <u>except within a new residential zone or a qualifying matter area</u> . Note that where one or more of the PDP building standards are not met, the proposal is assessed against the equivalent standard in the Operative District Plan and not this Proposed District Plan.	Accept See body of report	Yes	36.2	Support	Considers that it is appropriate to provide clarification around the interim legal effect of specific provisions of the plan, particularly where qualifying matters apply.	Allow
How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / How the Plan Works General	Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.12	Support in part	Supports the provided clarification in the IPI and PDP as to the legal effect of specific provisions. An amendment is sought to highlight to plan users the existence of qualifying matters and that if a development is located in an area where a qualifying matter applies, the MDRS does not have immediate legal effect. While submitter is aware the provision relating to legal effect and qualifying matters will technically not be required once the plan is made operative, considers that in the interim period it has concerns as to the lack of reference to qualifying matters and therefore supports any clarification that can be provided.	Amend the section Legal effect of rules, as follows: In addition, the District Plan gives effect to the 'Medium Density Residential Standards' (MDRS). The MDRS will replace the existing building standards in the residential zones (MRZ and HRZ) and set out the level of development that can occur on a site as a permitted activity. Specifically, MRZ-S1 to MRZ-S9 and HRZ-S1 to HRZ-S9 (excluding MRZ-S2 and HRZ-S2) have immediate legal effect, along with the related objectives, policies and rules, <u>except within a new residential zone or a qualifying matter area</u> . Note that where one or more of the PDP building standards are not met, the proposal is assessed against the equivalent standard in the Operative District Plan and not this Proposed District Plan.	Accept See body of report	Yes	36.3	Support	Considers that it is appropriate to provide clarification around the interim legal effect of specific provisions of the plan, particularly where qualifying matters apply.	Allow
How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / How the Plan Works General	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.2	Support	Generally supports these provisions as drafted.	Retain "How the Plan Works" section as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B – How the Plan Works

How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / General Approach	Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.13	Support	Supports the references to the standalone nature of the Infrastructure provisions. Such a reference assists in plan interpretation and application.	Retain the introductory text in the "Using the Plan" section as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / General Approach	Restaurant Brands Limited	349.3	Support	Support	Retain Te Anga Whānui - General Approach as notified.	Accept	no	NA	NA	NA	NA
How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / Cross Boundary Matters	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.34	Amend	Considers that there needs to be an emphasis on joint processing of consents would assist with giving effect to the NPS-FM.	Seeks the joint processing of consents be emphasized more.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / Cross Boundary Matters	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.35	Amend	Considers the WCC/PCC boundary should be highlighted due to its potential significance for the Porirua Stream. Any use and development, including the provision of infrastructure, affects downstream environments including Te Awarua o Porirua/Porirua Harbour, and the performance of the Porirua Wastewater Treatment Plant.	Seeks for WCC to identify/ highlight the cross-boundary issue that occurs across the Porirua Stream catchment.	Accept in part	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / Cross Boundary Matters	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.8	Support in part	Supports reference to joint processing of resource consents regarding Porirua harbour and cross boundary issues between Porirua and Wellington City.	Retain New definition as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / Cross Boundary Matters	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.9	Amend	Considers that the chapter should be amended to ensure that any use and development that impacts the downstream environment and Harbour as well as the Porirua Waste Water Treatment Plan performance.	Amend and redraft relevant sections of the Proposed District Plan to highlight and clearly spell out the significant cross boundary issue of pollution from Wellington City upstream to Te Awarua o Porirua.	Accept in part	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
How the Plan Works Subpart / How the Plan Works / Relationships Between Spatial Layers	Avryl Bramley	202.9	Amend	Considers it is not clear what the relationship between provisions is.	Seeks clarification how the Character precincts and Mount Victoria North Character Precincts provisions relate to one another.	Accept in part	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA

Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officer rec	Change to PDP?	Further Sub No/ Point No	Position	Reasons for Support or Opposition	Decision Requested
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Definitions - General	274.3	Support in part	The PDP contains a number of definitions that McDonald's Restaurants will fall under: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service retail • Retail activity • Commercial activity • Drive-through activity • Drive-through restaurant In general McDonald's supports these definitions; however, it is unclear how the definitions relate to each other.	Retain the Definitions, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Definitions - General	274.4	Amend	Given the discretionary default there needs to be certainty provided in this regards and McDonald's consider that it would be beneficial for the PDP to include a nesting table on the hierarchy of activities. This provides a logical method for organising different land use activities in a broader term.	Seeks amendment to include nesting table for definitions.	Accept	Yes	23.1	Support	FSNI support creating a nesting table within the definitions. Submission point 274.4 supports FSNI submission point 476.2.	Allow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Definitions - General	318.1	Amend	Considers that some definitions have a grey background due to being set by the National Planning Standards. It would be useful to have this noted at the start of the table.	Amend the Introduction to the Definitions chapter to state that 'Definitions set by the National Planning Standards are printed on a grey background'.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Definitions - General	349.4	Support	Support	Retain Ngā Tautuhinga – Definitions as notified.	Accept in part	No	23.31	Support	Submission point 349.4 supports FSNI submission points 476.3 - 476.6 however FSNI submission also seeks inclusion of a nesting table (476.2).	Allow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / Definitions - General	476.2	Amend	Considers that it would be beneficial for the PDP to include a nesting table on the hierarchy of activities because would provide a logical method for organising different land use activities in a broader term.	Seeks that the Definitions include a nesting table on the heirarchy of activities.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	70.3	Oppose	Considers that the word 'overlay' is used in a number of parts of the PDP, including Infrastructure and Subdivision. A definition would improve the meaning of these clauses for the convenience of plan users. The Porirua PDP includes a definition of overlay which can be adapted for use in the Wellington District Plan.	Opposes the absence of a definition for 'overlay' and seeks that one be added.	Reject	No	36.7	Oppose	WIAL supports the inclusion of a definition in principle as this will provide greater certainty for plan users. WIAL submits however, that the proposed definition only refers to schedules, despite the term "overlay" being used in other contexts within the Proposed Plan (such as "Air Noise Overlay").	Disallow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	70.4	Amend	Considers that the word 'overlay' is used in a number of parts of the PDP, including Infrastructure and Subdivision. A definition would improve the meaning of these clauses for the convenience of plan users.	Add new definition for 'Overlay' as follows: <u>means the spatially identified sites, items, features, or areas with distinctive values, risks or other factors within the City which require management in a different manner from underlying zone provisions, as set out in Schedules 1-8 and 10-12.</u>	Reject	No	36.8	Oppose	WIAL supports the inclusion of a definition in principle as this will provide greater certainty for plan users. WIAL submits however, that the proposed definition only refers to schedules, despite the term "overlay" being used in other contexts within the Proposed Plan (such as "Air Noise Overlay").	Disallow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	254.8	Amend	Considers that new definition will provide clarity around the walkable catchments that have been used in the PDP. As well as to provide flexibility in amending a	Add definition for 'walkable catchment', as follows: <u>WALKABLE CATCHMENT means the area an average person could walk</u>	Accept in part		80.40	Oppose	Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line does not meet the National Policy Statement on Urban Development definition of a rapid transit service.	Disallow

			walkable catchment in the future, should that be required.	<p><u>from a specific point to get to multiple destinations.</u> <u>The City Centre Zone uses a 15-minute walkable catchment.</u> <u>Walkable catchments around Metropolitan Centre zones and existing and planned rapid transit stops are also 15 minutes.</u></p>			89.68	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission to the extent that this aligns with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow
							130.15	Oppose	Submitter seeks definition of 'walk catchment' based on an average person. There is no 'average' person. A walk catchment is a planning device in relation to destination points. The MFE definition notes that a very simplistic radial pedestrian-shed analysis would be sufficient to determine a walk catchment, Living Streets Aotearoa do not agree.	Disallow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	266.54	Amend	Considers front, side and rear yards are not defined.	<p>Add a new definitions as follows:</p> <p><u>YARD</u> <u>means: any part of a site that must be kept clear and unobstructed by buildings and structures, except as otherwise provided for by this Plan.</u> <u>Yards will be measured in a horizontal plane at right angles to the boundary.</u> <u>- Front yard: where a site has frontage to a road, the area of land between the front boundary of the site and a line parallel to that boundary, extending the full width of the site. Where the site has two frontages to a road, each frontage is considered a front yard.</u> <u>- Rear yard: the area of land between the rear boundary of the site and a line parallel to that boundary, extending across the full width of the site. This will typically be the boundary associated with the rear elevation of a residential unit.</u> <u>- Side yard: the area of land between a side boundary of the site and a line parallel to that boundary, extending the full width of the site, but excluding those areas comprising front or rear yards.</u></p>	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	315.14	Amend	<p>Considers that as defined by section 771 and 770 of the RMA, the National Grid Corridor framework is considered a qualifying matter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is a matter required to give effect to the NPSET being a national policy statement (other than the NPS-UD); - it is a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure; - provisions that restrict development in relation to the National Grid are included in the Operative 	<p>Add a new definition for Qualifying Matter as follows: <u>Qualifying matter means a matter referred to in section 771 or 770 of the RMA.</u></p>	Accept in part	Yes	36.9	Support	WIAL supports in principle the inclusion of a definition for "qualifying matter" and "qualifying matter area" in the Proposed Plan. WIAL submits that this definition should be complete and further "qualifying matter areas" added. For example, the Wellington Airport Air Noise Boundary and Obstacle Limitation Surface should be included in the definition.	Allow

			<p>District Plan; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provisions that would protect the National Grid from inappropriate subdivision, use and development that would otherwise be permitted by the MDRS are included in the proposed district plan. <p>Considers given the role and importance of qualifying matters to the implementation of the RMA, the submitter supports the provision of a definition as an effective and practical method to clearly identify the existing qualifying matter provisions and provide clarity to plan users as to the provisions that will continue to apply where the MDRS and NPSUD intensification provisions would otherwise apply unrestricted.</p>				89.22	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes this request, as it considers that it is not required to aid in interpretation or implementation of the Plan. Kāinga Ora also opposes consequential changes to other provisions and rules referencing this proposed new term.</p>	Disallow
<p>Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition</p>	315.15	Amend	<p>Considers that as defined by section 771 and 770 of the RMA, the National Grid Corridor framework is considered a qualifying matter as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it is a matter required to give effect to the NPS-ET being a national policy statement (other than the NPS-UD); - it is a matter required for the purpose of ensuring the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure; - provisions that restrict development in relation to the National Grid are included in the Operative District Plan; and - provisions that would protect the National Grid from inappropriate subdivision, use and development that would otherwise be permitted by the MDRS are included in the proposed district plan. <p>Considers given the role and importance of qualifying matters to the implementation of the RMA, the submitter supports the provision of a definition as an effective and practical method to clearly identify the existing qualifying matter provisions and provide clarity to plan users as to the provisions that will continue to apply where the MDRS and NPSUD intensification provisions would otherwise apply unrestricted.</p> <p>[see Appendix D in submission for full reasons]</p>	<p>Add a new definition for Qualifying Matter Area as follows: <u>Qualifying matter area means a qualifying matter listed below:</u> <u>(a) The National Grid Yard / Transmission Line Buffer (32 metres)</u> <u>(b) The National Grid Subdivision Corridor/ Transmission Line Buffer (32 metres)</u> <u>(c)</u></p>	Accept in part	Yes	36.10	Support	<p>WIAL supports in principle the inclusion of a definition for “qualifying matter” and “qualifying matter area” in the Proposed Plan. WIAL submits that this definition should be complete and further “qualifying matter areas” added. For example, the Wellington Airport Air Noise Boundary and Obstacle Limitation Surface should be included in the definition.</p>	Allow
							72.1	Support	<p>Supports the definition of 'Qualifying matter area' provided the definition includes the rail corridor as a qualifying matter. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Amend Amend provision by including the rail corridor as a qualifying matter.

						89.23	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this request which would constrain urban development. Kāinga Ora also opposes all consequential changes to other provisions and rules referencing this proposed new term.	Disallow	
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	318.4	Amend	Considers that there is a definition of rapid transit stop, which references 'rapid transit service' and rapid transit stops are listed, along with railway stations in the definition of public transport activities. To future-proof the plan, it would be useful to define a minimum level for public transport to be considered rapid transit.	Add a new definition for 'Rapid Transit' as follows: <u>Includes public transport segregated from other traffic, including dedicated busways, trackless trams, trams, light rail and 'heavy' rail electrified multiple units</u>	Accept in part	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	377.7	Amend	Considers that a new definition of 'walking catchments' is needed, being the definition provided by Section 5.5 of the MfE guidance in relation to the NPS-UD.	Add a 'walkable catchment' definition to the plan, being the definition provided by Section 5.5 of the MfE guidance in relation to the NPS-UD: <u>A walkable catchment is the area that an average person could walk from a specific point to get to multiple destinations. A walkable catchment of 400 metres is typically associated with a five-minute average walk and 800 metres with a 10-minute average walk. These distances are also affected by factors such as land form (eg, hills take longer to walk up and can be an obstacle to walking), connectivity or severance (eg, the lack of ease and safety of crossing roads, highways and intersections), and the quality of footpaths. Walkable catchments can be determined either using a simple, radial pedshed analysis or a more detailed GIS (geographic information systems) network analysis.</u>	Accept in part		130.17	Oppose	Submitter seeks definition of 'walk catchment' based on an average person. There is no 'average' person. A walk catchment is a planning device in relation to destination points. The MfE definition notes that a very simplistic radial pedestrian-shed analysis would be sufficient to determine a walk catchment, Living Streets Aotearoa do not agree.	Disallow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	377.8	Amend	Considers that there should be a definition for "net zero emissions" or "zero carbon" to have consistency of language regarding the city's response to climate change. It is laudable to see a commitment to align with the goal of net zero emissions by 2050. However, this section uses inconsistent language and does not fully express the urgency needed to address climate change, nor the critical role that cities can play through their Plans.	Seeks that a single term, such as "net zero emissions" or "zero carbon" be defined.	Reject	No	36.13	Not specified	WIAL supports, in principle, the inclusion of a definition to this effect, however opposes to the extent that further clarity around the drafting and implementation effects of such a term should be included.	Allow Seeks that part of submission be allowed, but opposes to the extent that further clarity around the drafting and implementation effects of such a term should be included.
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	389.25	Amend	Considers that there is a need to add papakāinga to definitions. Considers that within Taranaki Whānui's future aspirations for their properties could include papakāinga. [see original submission]	Seeks that a definition of 'papakāinga' be added to the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in part	Yes	84.14	Support	Greater Wellington agree that the proposed definitions of 'restored' and 'restoration' do not adequately support the interpretation of the plan provisions. The terms are also not consistent with the regional plan.	Allow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	389.26	Amend	Considers that it is needed to add definition of ahi kā and how it is expressed by Taranaki Whānui	Seeks that definition of 'ahi kā' is added and how it is expressed by Taranaki Whānui .	Accept in part	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA

Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	389.27	Amend	Considers a definition for rāhui to be appropriate to add to the Proposed District Plan.	Seeks that a definition of 'rāhui' to be Added and to be discussed with Taranaki Whānui.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	436.6	Amend	Considers that there should be a definition for 'Walking Catchment' based on MfE guidance to the NPS-UD. The definition of a walkable catchment should also be consistent with the definitions used by Porirua City, Hutt City and Auckland City to provide certainty to the community. The decisions made about walkable catchments in relation to both the city centre and metropolitan zones are inconsistent and reduce, rather than increase the ability to intensify in areas that can be intensified for the benefit of providing extra housing and spaces for businesses and other facilities. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Add a new Definition for 'Walking Catchment'. The definition should be consistent with the following MfE guidance: <i>"A walkable catchment is the area that an average person could walk from a specific point to get to multiple destinations. A walkable catchment of 400 metres is typically associated with a five-minute average walk and 800 metres with a 10-minute average walk. These distances are also affected by factors such as land form (eg, hills take longer to walk up and can be an obstacle to walking), connectivity or severance (eg, the lack of ease and safety of crossing roads, highways and intersections), and the quality of footpaths. Walkable catchments can be determined either using a simple, radial pedshed analysis or a more detailed GIS (geographic information systems) network analysis."</i> and other City Councils' definitions, and should have the following criteria: (a) Within 1200 metres / 15 minutes of the edge of the City Centre; (b) Within 800 metres / 10 minutes of the edge of a Metropolitan Centre (e.g. Tawa, Johnsonville); (c) Within 800 metres / 10 minutes of Rapid Transit stops	Accept in part		130.16	Oppose	Submitter seeks definition of 'walk catchment' based on an average person. There is no 'average' person. A walk catchment is a planning device in relation to destination points. The definition proposed by M Rush et al refers to factors affecting the ease of walking but all of the factors mentioned are not considered in the walk catchment zones provided. More factors should be included to provide a finer level of detail. The MfE definition notes that a very simplistic radial pedestrian-shed analysis would be sufficient to determine a walk catchment, Living Streets Aotearoa do not agree.	Disallow
							131.44	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow

						136.27	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments. - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. 	Allow
						136.72	Support	<p>The submitter supports the original submission to increase walking catchments to 15 minutes for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Keep within the objectives of the NPS-UD. - The decision to revert to the 10-minute walking catchment removed just about every property in Oriental Bay from the High Density Residential Zone and therefore restricted the supply new housing in Oriental Bay. - Oriental Bay has a projection for high population growth, the High Density zoning would allow the suburb to grow and change to keep up with demand. - Oriental Bay is close to the City and 63% of residents commute by walking or cycling, supporting the 	Allow

								<p>requested High Density Residential Zone that comes from increasing the walking catchments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other Councils, including Auckland Council, have adopted a 15-minute walking catchment around city centres. - The government requires that walking catchments should only be constrained when there is good reason to, the submitter disagrees that there is good reason. - The 10-minute walkable catchment does not support the compact city goal as housing supply around the city centre will be constrained meaning more people will move to outer suburbs. [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. 	
						137.35	Support	<p>Supports 15 minute walkable catchments around Wellington CBD as it would sufficiently utilise the provisions of the NPS-UD and provide a number of benefits to Wellington, including environmentally friendly outcomes and housing affordability. A 10 minute walkable catchment would not encapsulate all those who are likely to walk into the city centre. Increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes is amply evidenced as being achievable and indeed desirable in Auckland, and would encourage peoples' inclination to walking. A larger catchment would provide attractive and affordable housing closer to the city centre, away from outer suburbs where people are likely to use cars as their main means of transportation. A 15-minute walkable catchment would promote growth in areas close to the city centre and encourage a shift to more environmentally friendly modes of transportation. WCC should use a 15 minute walkable catchment to fall in line with the NPS-UD to increase housing supply. It is not unreasonable to expect that a large portion of residents who live a 15 minute walk away from the city centre would choose to walk as their main mode of commute. WCC should take full advantage of the NPS- UD standards by increasing the walkable catchment to 15 minutes, which will provide many benefits to Wellington city.</p>	Allow

									[Refer to further submission for full reason]	
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / New definition	453.5	Amend	Considers that there should be a definition of 'Rapid Transit Service'. Questions whether rapid transit includes all rail services on the Kapiti and Hutt Valley lines in Wellington city? Does it include the Johnsonville line, where the EMU speed limits are lower than for the other lines? Does it include urban bus services supplied by GWRC/Metlink? It presumably includes future light rail links, although speed limits for light rail vehicles on city streets will presumably be lower than for "Heavy Rail" lines on dedicated tracks without pedestrians? [see Appendix D in original submission for full reasons]	Add definition of "rapid transit service" and clarify what services would be included in this definition. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept		NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ASSISTED HOUSING	377.9	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Assisted Housing' should also include papakainga (or mixed generation) housing as a qualifying criteria towards city outcomes. There is a shortage of this type of housing for Maori and some Pacifica families, and also other ethnicities whose custom it is to live this way. This could be incorporated by way of the definition of 'assisted housing' if deemed appropriate: if not, the submitter requests this is included as a separate criterion.	Amend the definition of Assisted Housing to add papakainga or multi generational housing. -	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / ASSISTED HOUSING	391.32	Oppose	Opposes defining 'Assisted Housing' and seeks deletion of this definition.	Delete the definition of 'Assisted Housing'.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BUILDING	314.3	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Building' should be clarified. The definition as it stands captures non- motorised caravans, which are not capable of moving under their own power. The definition also creates several potential implications, which stem from the fact that individuals with non-motorised caravans will, by definition, be using and parking in a 'building'..7	Amend the definition of 'Building' as follows: means a temporary or permanent movable or immovable physical construction that is: a) partially or fully roofed; and b) fixed or located on or in land; but excludes; any motorised vehicle, or other mode of transport that could be moved under its own power, <u>or non-motorised caravans other than those used for a residential accommodation/business purpose for a continuous period of more than two (2) months.</u>	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BUILDING	318.5	Support	The definition is supported. It is noted that part a. of the definition means an unroofed deck is excluded from the definition of building.	Not specified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BUILDING COVERAGE	318.6	Support	The definition is supported. It is noted that the definition uses 'net site area' and 'building footprint' both of which are defined terms. An indication of this or a link to them would be useful.	Not specified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BUILDING COVERAGE	318.7	Amend	Considers that the definition uses 'net site area' and 'building footprint' both of which are defined terms. An indication of this or a link to them would be useful.	Amend the definition of 'Building Coverage' to indicate or refer to the definitions of 'Net Site Area' and 'Building Footprint'. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / BUILDING FOOTPRINT	318.8	Amend	Considers that the definition uses 'buildings', 'any of those buildings' and 'the building' which is less than clear. In many parts of Wellington 'ground level' may vary by several floors between opposite sides of a building and identifying which is the 'ground floor' (as distinct from the 'main' or largest floor) is not obvious. The extent to which decks and eaves are included is not clear. A 'section of a building' does not obviously include eaves and it would be odd if the existence of an eave over part of a deck meant it qualified as partially roofed and therefore become a building. It is noted this definition is on a grey background so is from National Planning Standards. If it cannot be changed as requested, a supplementary definition specific to Wellington conditions is requested instead.	Amend the definition of 'Building Footprint' as follows: means, in relation to building coverage, the total area of buildings at the floor or floors nearest to ground floor level together with the area of any section of any of those buildings that extends out beyond the ground floor level limits of the that building and overhangs the ground. Any eaves up to 600 mm are not to be included in this total. <u>Unroofed decks, even when partially sheltered by eaves, are excluded from the definition of building and do not count towards the building footprint.</u>	Reject	No	116.2	Support	"While the definition of "building footprint" is from the National Planning Standards, Wellington City Council's interpretation that where the eave of a building extends partially over an open deck adjacent to a house requires all of the deck area to be counted as part of the "building footprint" is not the intention of the definition. If Central Government intended decks to be buildings or included in the footprint for coverage purposes, the NPS and MDRS would have been specific on this matter. SSNZ Wellington note that the National Planning Standards allow the inclusion of a subcategory term, or additional terms that have a different meaning. Therefore, a supplementary definition of "uncovered deck" is required that is excluded from the definition of "building" and "building footprint"."	Allow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / CHILDCARE SERVICE	400.4	Support	Supports the definition. The submitter supports the definition for educational facility also as it includes provision for childcare services also. However, the submitter considers that the definition for childcare services accurately reflects the broad range of activities that may be considered a childcare service. The submitter considers that the definition will be beneficial to differentiate between childcare facilities and schools both of which are educational facilities.	Retain the definition of [Childcare Service] as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY	404.5	Support	Supports definition of "commercial activity".	Retain definition of "commercial activity" as notified.	Accept	No	23.32	Support	Submission point 404.5 supports FSNI submission 476.3.	Allow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY	476.3	Support	Supports the definition of "Commercial activity".	Retain the definition of "Commercial activity" as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS ACTIVITY	240.3	Support	Considers that the definition is consistent with the wording provided for in the National Planning Standards. Community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.	Retain the definition of "community corrections activity" as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY FACILITY	273.5	Support in part	Supports the definition insofar as it includes land and buildings used by the community for safety purposes. However, as currently drafted, the definition could potentially be interpreted to include fire stations which FENZ does not consider appropriate. Whilst it is acknowledged that the District Plan has a separate definition for 'Emergency Service Facilities', which is supported, the 'community facilities' definition does not expressly exclude land and buildings used for emergency service facilities.	Supports the definition of "community facility" with amendment.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY FACILITY	273.6	Amend	Supports the definition insofar as it includes land and buildings used by the community for safety purposes. However, as currently drafted, the definition could potentially be interpreted to include fire stations which FENZ does not consider appropriate. Whilst it is acknowledged that the District Plan has a separate definition for 'Emergency Service Facilities', which is supported, the 'community facilities' definition does not expressly exclude land and buildings used for emergency service facilities.	Amend definition of "community facility": Means the use of land and buildings for non-custodial services for safety, welfare and community purposes, including probation, rehabilitation and reintegration services, assessments, reporting, workshops and programmes, administration, and a meeting point for community works groups. <u>Note: 'Community facility' excludes land and buildings used for emergency service facilities which is covered by the definition 'Emergency Service Facilities'.</u>	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMMUNITY FACILITY	400.5	Support	Supports the definition as it is consistent with the National Planning Standards.	Retain the definition of [Community Facility] as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY	355.11	Support in part	Supports the definition of 'Development Capacity' in principle as it is important to clearly identify the provision of infrastructure as a key element in the terms meaning and coverage. However, an amendment is sought regarding the inclusion of non-Council controlled infrastructure.	Retain the definition of 'Development Capacity', with amendment.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY	355.12	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Development Capacity' should include the provision of non-Council controlled infrastructure. As it stands, the term 'Development Infrastructure' is taken to only include infrastructure controlled or owned by Council.	Amend the definition of 'Development Capacity' as follows: means the capacity of land to be developed for housing or for business use, based on: a. the zoning, objectives, policies, rules, and overlays that apply in the relevant proposed and operative RMA planning documents; and b. the provision of adequate development infrastructure <u>and additional infrastructure</u> to support the development of land for housing or business use.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEVELOPMENT INFRASTRUCTURE	355.13	Not specified	Neutral on the definition of 'development infrastructure'. Considers that any prioritising 'Development Infrastructure' over 'Additional Infrastructure' will not achieve the stated development objectives and policies of the PDP. Critical and or key infrastructure provision (such as the electricity distribution network) should be given the same level of recognition and priority as that of Council	Retain the Definition of 'Development Infrastructure' as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

			owned and controlled 'Development infrastructure'. [Refer to original submission]							
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEVELOPMENT INFRASTRUCTURE	370.19	Support	Supports the definition of development infrastructure.	Retain the definition of 'Development Infrastructure' as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEVELOPMENT INFRASTRUCTURE	373.3	Not specified	Considers that the current definition does not include access to waste facilities. For higher densities to occur, waste management has to be carefully planned for.	Not specified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEVELOPMENT INFRASTRUCTURE	402.13	Support in part	Supports 'Development Infrastructure' definition in part.	Retain the definition of 'Development Infrastructure' with amendments.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / DEVELOPMENT INFRASTRUCTURE	402.14	Amend	Considers that CentrePort should be listed in the definition. CentrePort holds considerable land that also adjoins the Coastal Marine Area and has extensive network and land transport infrastructure within these landholdings. The agencies listed do not include CentrePort as being appropriate to carry out such works.	Amend definition of 'Development Infrastructure' as follows: means the following, to the extent they are controlled by a local authority, or council controlled organisation (as defined in section 6 of the Local Government Act 2002) or CentrePort; ...	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EDUCATION FACILITY	370.1	Oppose	One definition is superfluous, but both terms are used in the PDP. It is preferred that the definition of "Educational facility" is the only one used throughout the PDP, so that child-care facilities are also clearly subject to reverse sensitivity (as they will then come under the definition of sensitive activity).	Delete mentions of "Education Facility" through ought the plan and replace them with "Educational Facility".	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EDUCATION FACILITY	400.1	Oppose	Considers that the inclusion of the definition in the Proposed District Plan would result in two similar definitions, 'education facility' and 'educational facility'. The submitter considers that this may cause confusion for the District Plan users. The submitter considers that the main difference between the two definitions is 'education facility' excludes childcare facilities in the residential zones. However, this is already been outlined in the rule framework.	Delete the definition of [Education Facility] in its entirety.	Accept	Yes	36.18	Support	WIAL supports the deletion of this definition as the activity is inherently captured by the definition of "educational facility" (and associated definitions such as "noise sensitive activity").	Allow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EDUCATIONAL FACILITY	400.6	Support	Supports the definition as it is consistent with the National Planning Standards.	Retain the definition of [Educational Facility] as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EMERGENCY SERVICE FACILITIES	273.7	Support	Supports the definition of "emergency service facilities" as it provides an appropriate rule framework to better provide for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations.	Retain the definition of "emergency service facilities" as drafted.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / EMERGENCY SERVICE FACILITIES	404.6	Support	Supports the definition of "emergency service facilities". In particular, the inclusion of fire stations and administration related to emergency services.	Retain the definition of "emergency service facilities" as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / FUNCTIONAL NEED	228.5	Support	Considers the definition matches the definition in the National Planning Standards.	Retain the definition of 'Functional Need' as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / FUNCTIONAL NEED	271.12	Support	Supports the definition on the basis it reflects the National Planning Standards and provides certainty for users.	Retain the definition of FUNCTIONAL NEED as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / FUNCTIONAL NEED	273.8	Support	Supports the definition of "functional need" as it defines activities that have a need to be located in certain locations where the activity is specifically required. Fire stations may have a functional need to be located in certain areas, including those with increased risk of natural hazards. The ability to construct and operate fire stations in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies is paramount the health, safety and wellbeing of people and the community. Fire stations therefore need to be strategically located within and throughout communities to maximise their coverage and minimise response times so that they can efficiently and effectively respond to emergency call outs in a timely way, thus avoiding or mitigating the potential for adverse effects associated with fire hazard and other emergencies.	Retain the definition of "functional need" as drafted.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / FUNCTIONAL NEED	315.20	Support	Considers the definition reflects that provided in the National Planning Standards and is therefore supported.	Retain the definition of 'Functional Need' as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / FUNCTIONAL NEED	359.5	Amend	Considers that the definition of functional need should not be limited to location- specific needs but could rather require a building or feature to be designed in a particular manner. This term is included within matters of discretion for infringing a number of standards in the CMUZ zones, which is supported. However it is considered that the definitions of this term needs to be amended accordingly.	Amend the definition of 'Functional Need' as follows: The need for a proposal or activity to traverse, locate or operate in a particular environment or be designed in a particular way because the activity can only occur in that environment because of functional characteristics or constraints.	Reject	No	101.4	Oppose	'Functional Need' is an expression that has come into use in resource management practice usually in association with the particular requirements of infrastructure (not general development activity). The definition should be retained as notified to ensure its specialist intent is not compromised by wider application.	Disallow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / GROUND LEVEL	318.9	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Ground Level' needs clarification. As records of title do not generally have levels along boundaries recorded, a. will be largely theoretical. For b. if there is a Resource or a Building Consent applied for, existing presumably means existing as of the date of the consent application. For work that is a permitted use and requires no consents, the date the work starts is the relevant one but there may be no record of this. For c. where a wall face is immediately adjacent to, rather than 'intersecting; the boundary, the relevant surface is the wall face adjacent to the boundary and the relevant level is the level of the ground against that face. This case can be described as a wall 'on' the boundary. If the retaining wall or structure actually 'intersects' the boundary (now at d.), the surface at the boundary is the top surface of that wall or structure. This surface may well be higher than the ground level on the uphill side of the wall, particularly if the top	Amend the definition of 'Ground Level' as follows: means: a. the actual finished surface level of the ground after the most recent subdivision that created at least one additional allotment was completed (when the record of title is created); b. if the ground level cannot be identified under paragraph (a), the existing surface level of the ground; c. if, in any case under paragraph (a) or (b), a retaining wall or retaining structure is located immediately adjacent to or on the boundary, but does not cross it, the level on the exterior surface of the retaining wall or retaining structure where it intersects the boundary. d. if, in any case under paragraph	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

			of the wall is extended to provide a barrier against falling. In this 'intersecting' case, the ground level is best determined by using the level of ground at the uphill surface of the wall. It is noted this definition is on a grey background so is from National Planning Standards. If it cannot be changed as requested, a supplementary definition specific to Wellington conditions is requested instead.	<u>(a) or (b), a retaining wall or retaining structure intersects or crosses the boundary, the level on the uphill/higher exterior surface of the retaining wall.</u>						
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HABITABLE ROOM	266.55	Oppose	Considers the definition of Habitable Room is included twice.	Delete the second occurrence of the 'Habitable Room' definition as follows: HABITABLE ROOM means any room used for the purposes of teaching or used as a living room, dining room, sitting room, bedroom, office or other room specified in the Plan to be a similarly occupied room.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HABITABLE ROOM	273.9	Support	Supports the definition of "habitable room" as it is consistent with the National Planning Standards definition	Retain the definition of "habitable room" as drafted.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HABITABLE ROOM	370.21	Support	Supports the definition of habitable room.	Retain the definition of 'Habitable Room' as notified.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HEALTH CARE FACILITY	350.3	Oppose in part	Considers that retirement villages typically offer a range of physical or mental health or welfare services to their residents; however, these are an ancillary activity to the primary residential purpose / function of the retirement villages. Considers that it is important the Proposed Plan explicitly recognises retirement villages as residential activities. Seeks that retirement villages are excluded from the definition.	Opposes the definition of HEALTH CARE FACILITY and seeks amendment.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HEALTH CARE FACILITY	350.4	Amend	Considers that retirement villages typically offer a range of physical or mental health or welfare services to their residents; however, these are an ancillary activity to the primary residential purpose / function of the retirement villages. Considers that it is important the Proposed Plan explicitly recognises retirement villages as residential activities. Seeks that retirement villages are excluded from the definition.	Amend definition of HEALTH CARE FACILITY as follows: means land and buildings used for providing physical or mental health or welfare services, including medical practitioners, dentists and dental technicians, opticians, physiotherapists, medical social workers and counsellors, midwives, paramedical practitioners, alternative therapists, providers of health and wellbeing services; diagnostic laboratories, and accessory offices, but excluding hospitals and retirement villages.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HEALTH CARE FACILITY	380.22	Support	Supports definition of 'Health care facility' as it recognises a wide range of services.	Retain the definition of HEALTH CARE FACILITY as notified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HEAVY INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITY	377.10	Amend	Considers that the Definition of 'Heavy Industrial Activity' should be amended, as it is not appropriate to group all waste management activities as heavy industry. Community waste collection and recycling could be key aspects of a more sustainable 'circular' economy. Also, having close-by small scale waste disposal and recycling will be critical to providing for walkable communities - and this definition, as the associated restriction in heavy industrial activities in neighbourhood zones, will limit that.	Amend the definition of 'Heavy Industrial Activity' as follows: means an Industrial Activity that generates: offensive and objectionable noise, dust or odour, significant volumes of heavy vehicle movements, or elevated risks to people's health and safety. Heavy Industrial Activities include - quarries, abattoirs, refineries, the storage, transfer, treatment, or disposal of waste materials or significant volumes of hazardous substances, other waste management processes or composting of organic materials.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / HEIGHT IN RELATION TO BOUNDARY	318.10	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Height in Relation to Boundary' needs clarification. Height is defined as "the vertical distance between a specified reference point and the highest part of any feature, structure or building above that point". When using the term "height of a structure" a specific vertical reference point needs to be specified, not just a distance from the boundary. I note this definition (as well as the definition for 'height') is on a grey background so is from National Planning Standards. If it cannot be changed as requested, a supplementary definition specific to Wellington conditions is requested instead.	Amend definition of Height in relation to boundary as follows: means the height of a structure, building or feature, relative to its distance from either the boundary of a <u>measured vertically from ground level at:</u> a. the boundary of the site; or b. <u>a notional boundary within the site;</u> or c. <u>another specified reference point outside the site relative to its horizontal distance from that reference point.</u>	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MARAE ACTIVITY	297.7	Support	Supports the definition of marae activity in the PDP, and deems all activities listed to be an accurate summary.	Retain the definition for 'marae activity' as notified.	Accept	yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MULTI-UNIT HOUSING	350.5	Oppose in part	Considers that as currently drafted the definition could be interpreted to encompass retirement villages which provide four or more residential units on a site. Retirement villages are provided for as a separate activity throughout the Proposed Plan. Considers that it is important the Proposed Plan provides a bespoke retirement village planning regime. Seeks that retirement villages are excluded from the definition.	Opposes definition of MULTI-UNIT HOUSING and seeks amendment.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MULTI-UNIT HOUSING	350.6	Amend	Considers that as currently drafted the definition could be interpreted to encompass retirement villages which provide four or more residential units on a site. Retirement villages are provided for as a separate activity throughout the Proposed Plan. Considers that it is important the Proposed Plan provides a bespoke retirement village planning regime. Seeks that retirement villages are excluded from the definition.	Amend the definition of MULTI-UNIT HOUSING as follows: means any development that will result in four or more residential units on a site, excluding <u>retirement villages and</u> residential development within the Oriental Bay Precinct Area.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / MULTI- UNIT HOUSING	391.35	Oppose	Opposes defining 'Multi-Unit Housing' as a separate activity type from stand-alone houses or any other residential typology for the purposes of the zone rules and standards. Seeks deletion of this definition. Consequential changes will also be needed throughout the residential, commercial, and mixed-use zone provisions to remove this distinction. It is considered that residential development should be considered on the basis of its effects and merits rather than specifically on typology or the scale/collective number of dwellings.	Delete the definition of 'Multi-Unit Housing'.	Reject	No	80.61	Oppose	Considers this is an important term used throughout the plan and needs to be defined to provide clarity about what the planning rules mean.	Disallow
					Reject	No	117.5	Oppose	The removal of the definition of multi unit housing is opposed. This form of housing requires special design consideration.	Disallow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OPERATIONAL NEED	228.7	Support	Considers that the definition matches the definition in the National Planning Standards.	Retain the definition of 'Operational Need' as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OPERATIONAL NEED	273.13	Support	Supports the definition of "operational need" as it defines activities that have a need to operate in certain locations where the activity is specifically required. Fire stations that have a need to be located in certain areas may including areas with increased risk of natural hazards.	Retain the definition of "operational need" as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OPERATIONAL NEED	315.30	Support	Considers the definition reflects that provided in the National Planning Standards and has high relevance to the National Grid within the PDP given the operational needs of the National Grid.	Retain the definition of Operational Need as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OPERATIONAL NEED	359.6	Amend	Considers that the definition of operational need should not be limited to location- specific needs but could rather require a building or feature to be designed in a particular manner. This term is included within matters of discretion for infringing a number of standards in the CMUZ zones, which is supported. However it is considered that the definitions of this term needs to be amended accordingly.	Amend the definition of 'Operational Need' as follows: The need for a proposal or activity to traverse, locate or operate in a particular environment or be designed in a particular way because of technical, logistical or operational characteristics or constraints.	Reject	No	101.5	Oppose	Considers that 'Operational Need' is an expression that has come into use in resource management practice usually in association with the particular requirements of infrastructure (not general development activity). The definition should be retained as notified to ensure its specialist intent is not compromised by wider application.	Disallow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / OPERATIONAL NEED	400.9	Support	Supports the definition as at times the submitter has an operational need to establish educational facilities in areas prone to natural hazards. The submitter acknowledges the Proposed District Plan provisions which relate to buildings and infrastructure which have an operational need to be established in natural hazard areas.	Retain the definition of [Operational Need] as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / PRIMARY PRODUCTION	40.4	Amend	Supports the definition of 'Primary Production' and recognition of agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, and forestry activities.	Retain the definition of 'Primary Production' as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACTIVITY	370.30	Support	Supports the definition of public transport activity.	Retain the definition of 'Public Transport Activity' as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACTIVITY	402.25	Support	Supports the intent of this definition.	Retain the definition of 'Public Transport Activity' as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACTIVITY	408.12	Support	Supports the inclusion of services relating to train stations, ferry terminals and ancillary ticketing and passenger facilities, within this definition.	Retain definition of PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACTIVITY as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RAPID TRANSIT STOP	254.9	Amend	<p>Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line meets the definition and criteria of rapid transit in the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Considers that the NPS-UD is intended to align new higher density development along places with existing infrastructure. The Johnsonville Rail Line is underused and has spare capacity.</p> <p>Considers that the Greater Wellington Regional Council identification of the Johnsonville line as rapid transit in the RLTP 2021 as the best available source of information for the matter.</p> <p>Considers that failure to identify Johnsonville Rail Line as rapid transit will make the Proposed District Plan inconsistent with the requirements of Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Considers that identifying the Johnsonville rail line as a rapid transit service and intensifying around it will support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Considers that MfE guidance references Wellington's commuter rail services as an example of existing rapid transit stops as supporting Johnsonville Rail Line to be designated a rapid transit service.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend definition of 'rapid transit stop' as follows: RAPID TRANSIT STOP means a place where people can enter or exit a rapid transit service, whether existing or planned. <u>The following stations on the Kapiti Line are rapid transit stops:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wellington Station • Takapu Road Station • Redwood Station • Tawa Station • Linden Station • Kenepuru Station <p><u>The following stations on the Johnsonville Line are rapid transit stops:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crofton Downs Station • Ngairo Station • Awarua Street Station • Simla Crescent Station • Box Hill Station • Khandallah Station • Raroa Station • Johnsonville Station <p><u>The following station on the Hutt/Melling Line is a rapid transit stop:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ngauranga Station 	Accept in part		80.41	Oppose	Considers that the Johnsonville Rail Line does not meet the National Policy Statement on Urban Development definition of a rapid transit service.	Disallow
							80.4	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are "planned" in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	Disallow
							89.69	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this submission to the extent that this aligns with the Kāinga Ora primary submission.	Allow
							89.70	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that train stations do not need to be identified in the definition.	Disallow
							100.10	Oppose	Submtter 254 proposes the encouragement of 'Pop-up public realm's for dwellings shaded by developments. This is in effect telling people to go outside, to the beach or park if they want sun. Or a glass van will drive round and people can sit in it for 5 minutes before it drives away somewhere else. 'Closing time drink up ya tea'. That just doesn't match how people use their time, the independence of when you can relax. It's simply costly and silly. It is not even a viable proposal in the summer heat when you may want sun to warm the house or dry the clothes but not be in it. But especially in winter when sun is so important for comfort but it is still very cold outside. This heavily impacts the elderly and puts them at higher risk from illnesses. Wellington is not called windy for nothing. These suggestions take no account of how vulnerable some people feel outside and increases the chances of predatory behaviour onto the vulnerable. Every dwelling should be an	Disallow

								<p>excellent one and this submission does nothing for that. In theory even new developments could be overshadowed and it's just bad luck. [Inferred reference to submission point 254.9]</p>	
						114.7	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD definition states that Rapid Transit Services must be "frequent" and this definition therefore excludes PT services that are not frequent from being classified as Rapid Transit Services. Considers that Greater Wellington Regional Council (GWRC) has incorrectly assessed the Johnsonville Line is a Rapid transit Service because they used a one line statement in the One Network Framework (ONF) drafted by the Road Efficiency Group and published by Waka Katohi. In contrast to the NPS-UD, the ONF definition also classifies passenger rail services that are not frequent as Rapid Transit which is incorrect. The Johnsonville Line is not a frequent service (mostly 2 services/hour) and therefore cannot be classified as a Rapid Transit Service. Considers the One Network Framework is not able tool for this assessment - as confirmed in writing by the Waka Katohi One Network Framework Programme Manager. In contrast, Auckland Transport has developed a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria and under their criteria, the Onehunga Line is assessed as Nnot being Rapid Transit under the NPS-UD. Applying these same criteria to the Johnsonville Line would also find it is not Rapid Transit. Further, the WCC has also failed to use a PT assessment standard based on suitable public transport criteria to assess whether Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops under the NPS-UD. Therefore any claim that Johnsonville Line Stations are Rapid Transit Stops is also invalid. [Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Disallow Retain Johnsonville Line as notified (Not considered Rapid Transit).</p>

<p>Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RAPID TRANSIT STOP</p>	<p>370.31</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Supports the definition of rapid transit stop.</p>	<p>Retain the definition of 'Rapid Transit Stop' as notified.</p>	<p>Reject</p>		<p>72.5</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>Supports the definition of 'Rapid transit stop' which aligns with the NPSUD definition. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	<p>Allow</p>
<p>Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RAPID TRANSIT STOP</p>	<p>436.8</p>	<p>Amend</p>	<p>Considers that the rapid transit stops interpretation should be amended to clarify which stations are rapid transit stops and include stops missing from the Johnsonville Line and Kapiti Line. The Kaiwharawhara station should be included in the Kapiti Line, as whilst currently unused, the NPS-UD references future transport routes as well as current. This station, which could be easily reinstated, is in an area increasingly important for both commercial and industrial activities, and housing.</p>	<p>Amend the definition of 'Rapid Transit Stop' as follows: means a place where people can enter or exit a rapid transit service, whether existing or planned. <u>The following stations on the Kapiti Line are rapid transit stops:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wellington Station • Kaiwharawhara Station* currently in abeyance • Takapu Road Station • Redwood Station • Tawa Station • Linden Station • Kenepuru Station <u>The following stations on the Johnsonville Line are rapid transit stops:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crofton Downs Station • Ngaio Station • Awarua Street Station • Simla Crescent Station • Box Hill Station • Khandallah Station • Raroa Station • Johnsonville Station <u>The following station on the Hutt/Melling Line is a rapid transit stop:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ngauranga Station </p>	<p>Accept in part</p>		<p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>NA</p>

Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	99.1	Support	Supports (b) of the definition, which is consistent with the proposed amended definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure in regard to telecommunication and radio communications networks in Proposed Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.	Retain clause (b) of the Definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure as notified.	Accept in part		NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	127.1	Oppose in part	Considers that Clause (a) of the definition of "Regionally Significant Infrastructure" relates to pipelines for the distribution or transmission of natural or manufactured gas or petroleum. Powerco prefers the wording in the first bullet point of the proposed amended definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure in Proposed Change 1 to the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement that also recognises pipelines may include ancillary equipment to enable them to function.	Amend clause (a) of the definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure as follows: a. Pipelines for the distribution or transmission of natural or manufactured gas or petroleum, <u>including any associated fittings, appurtenances, fixtures or equipment.</u>	Reject	No	97.2	Support	Firstgas supports the intent of the submission which is seeking an amendment to the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure'. The submission seeks to amend the definition so that where it refers to pipelines for the distribution or transmission of natural or manufactured gas or petroleum it specifically includes 'any associated fittings, appurtenances, fixtures or equipment.' This submission aligns with the intent of Firstgas' original submission seeking to amend this definition to specifically refer to 'The Gas Transmission Network'. This is to ensure that clarity is provided that any associated above or below-ground fitting, appurtenance, fixture or equipment required for the conveyance of the product or material in the pipeline is captured within the definition. Firstgas supports the submission in addition to seeking that the Gas Transmission Network is also specifically added to the definition.	Allow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	228.8	Support	Considers the definition matches the definition in the Proposed Natural Resources Plan (following settlement of appeals) and the proposed RPS change #1 and is supported by the regional community.	Retain the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	273.14	Support	Supports the definition of "regionally significant infrastructure", particularly the inclusion of the water supply network in the definition.	Retain the definition of "regionally significant infrastructure" as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	304.9	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' should be amended so that it incorporates the wider gas transmission network rather than the pipelines only. The network (which includes the ancillary above and below ground infrastructure), as opposed to solely the pipelines, delivers gas to consumers, thereby providing for their well-being and their health and safety. As such, it is the network, not only the pipelines that should be defined as Regionally Significant Infrastructure. (Option A)	Amend the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' as follows: Regionally Significant Infrastructure: means regionally significant infrastructure including: Pipelines for the distribution of natural or manufactured gas or petroleum a. <u>The Gas Transmission Network</u> b. c. Facilities and structures necessary for the operation of telecommunications and radiocommunications networks operated by network utility operators;	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				e-d, the National Grid						
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	304.10	Amend	Considers that wider gas transmission network be included within the Regionally Significant Infrastructure, rather than the pipelines only. Relief to achieve this submission could be that any associated above or below-ground fitting, appurtenance, fixture or equipment required for the conveyance of the product or material in the pipeline and/or for its safe, efficient or effective operation is included in the definition. (Option B)	Amend the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' to include any associated above or below-ground fitting, appurtenance, fixture or equipment required for the conveyance of the product or material in the pipeline and/or for its safe, efficient or effective operation.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	315.32	Support	Considers the provision of a definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure and its use throughout the plan reflects the approach used within the Wellington Regional Policy Statement. While references, policies and methods specific to the National Grid (both within the policy and any rule framework) are supported, the inclusion of the National Grid within the definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure is supported.	Retain the definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	345.10	Oppose in part	Seeks that the definition is confined (not including) to the listed matters. As such, we seek the deletion of the word 'including', and the insertion of the word 'means'. Considers paragraph a. needs to be more clearly defined to ensure it doesn't apply to things that are less than regionally significant, for example, piped gas for a subdivision. Considers paragraph j. should refer specifically to the port areas intended to be covered. Further, the following clause should be deleted: 'adjacent land used in association with the movement of cargo and passengers and including bulk fuel supply infrastructure, and storage tanks for bulk liquids, and associated wharf lines'. Either these areas are part of the Port, or they should not be included as RSI (just as the Wgtn Airport is defined).	Amend the definition of "regionally significant infrastructure": Means regionally significant infrastructure including: a. regionally significant pipelines for the distribution or transmission of natural or manufactured gas or petroleum; b. facilities and structures necessary for the operation of telecommunications and radiocommunications networks operated by network utility operators; c. the National Grid; d. facilities for the generation and/or transmission of electricity where it is supplied to the National Grid and/or the local distribution network; e. the local authority water supply network and water treatment plants; f. the local authority wastewater and stormwater networks, systems and wastewater treatment plants; g. the Strategic Transport Network, as identified in the operative Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan; h. Wellington City bus terminal and Wellington Railway Station terminus; i. Wellington International Airport; and j. Commercial Port Areas within Wellington Harbour (refine areas) and adjacent land used in association with the movement of cargo and passengers and including bulk fuel supply infrastructure, and storage	Reject	No	44.16	Support	Support the wording changes and removal of redundant words and areas of land.	Allow
							61.1	Oppose	The proposed change to the definition in regard to gas networks does not align with different changes being sought by Powerco and is unhelpful by referring to regionally significant pipelines (including gas) within the definition whereas the definition is intended to define what is regionally significant infrastructure.	Disallow
							72.6	Oppose	Rejects amendments that result in a departure to the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement definition of 'Regionally significant infrastructure'. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on	Disallow

				tanks for bulk liquids, and associated wharflines					the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	
							97.3	Oppose	Firstgas opposes this submission in part which seeks to amend the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' so that it more clearly defined.	Disallow
							101.6	Oppose	Considers that the definition matches the definition in the GWRC Natural Resources Plan which was settled following mediation of appeals. It is widely accepted and does not need the refinement requested.	Disallow
							104.1	Oppose	Defence facilities are critical for New Zealand's security and for the safety and well-being of the community. Although NZDF does not currently have major facilities in Wellington City, this does not preclude the need for future defence infrastructure in Wellington City and it is appropriate they are included in the definition as requested in NZDF's original submission. Use of the term 'including' in the definition is critical to ensuring regionally significant infrastructure that is not yet captured under this definition is not excluded, should they not be explicitly listed in the definition.	Disallow Reject submitter's relief and retain definition of infrastructure as notified but with the addition of "defence facilities" as requested in NZDF's original submission.
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	355.15	Support in part	Supports the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' in part and seeks amendment to ensure the WCC definition is consistent with other recent plan reviews in the Wellington Region. In particular, considers that the definition should align with the GWRC Natural Resource Plan, which has been confirmed through a negotiated court order.	Retain the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure', with amendment.	Reject	No	41.1	Support	Removal of "...facilities for the generation (of electricity)..." fits with the definition's intention enable conveyancing: i.e. transmission, flow and movement of electricity, water and people. Generation facilities themselves appear to be an anomalous inclusion. Disallow those submissions that support the definition as notified.	Allow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	355.16	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' should be amended to align with the definition in the GWRC Natural Resources Plan. Consider the definition should appropriately differentiate the two distinct elements of the distribution network. Wellington Electricity Lines Limited's distribution network consists of lower	Amend the Definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' as follows: means regionally significant infrastructure including: ... d. facilities for the generation and/or transmission of electricity where it is supplied to the National Grid and/o	Reject	No	29.40	Support	Transpower accepts the relief sought on the basis specific reference is retained in the definition to the National Grid.	Allow Seeks that part of the submission be allowed in so far as consistent with the relief sought in the Transpower submission.

			voltage electricity supply within the local distribution network. The distribution network also contains higher-voltage transmission lines that takes electricity supply from the National Grid (from Grid Exit Points – GXP) which is then supplied to the lower voltage to service the local distribution network. It is considered important for the 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' definition in the PDP to be consistent with other recent plan review processes in the Wellington Region– and therefore adopt the same definition as in the GWRC Natural Resource Plan, as well as the decisions version of the Proposed Porirua City District Plan. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]	r the local distribution network, d. facilities for the electricity distribution network, where it is 11kV, and above. This excludes private connections to the local distribution network. ...	Reject	No	41.2	Support	Removal of "...facilities for the generation (of electricity)..." fits with the definition's intention enable conveyancing: i.e. transmission, flow and movement of electricity, water and people. Generation facilities themselves appear to be an anomalous inclusion. Disallow those submissions that support the definition as notified.	Allow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	370.32	Support	Supports the definition of regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	402.26	Support	Supports definition, noting that this is the Regional Policy Statement definition (Subject to the definition of Port being amended).	Retain the definition of 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure' as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	406.41	Support	Insofar as it relates to Wellington International Airport, the definition is consistent with the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement definition of regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain definition of "REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE" as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	408.14	Amend	Supports the inclusion of the Strategic Transport Network within this definition. All railway corridors are included in the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 definition of Strategic Transport Network. KiwiRail seeks an addition to clarify that the Interislander ferry terminal is expressly included in this definition. The description of the Strategic Transport Network in Appendix B of the Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan 2021 refers to railway corridors. While the railway corridor extends to the Interislander ferry terminal it is not expressly referenced in the description. KiwiRail seeks to avoid any ambiguity that the ferry terminal is not part of the Strategic Transport Network.	Amend definition of REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE as follows: ... g. the Strategic Transport Network, as identified in the operative Wellington Regional Land Transport Plan; h. <u>Interislander Ferry Terminal</u> , Wellington City bus terminal and Wellington Railway Station terminus; i. Wellington International Airport; and ... k. Defence Facilities	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT INFRASTRUCTURE	423.3	Amend	Supports 'defence facilities' being added to the definition of regionally significant infrastructure. Considers that the wording of this definition is amended, as currently the wording is circular, i.e. 'Regionally Significant Infrastructure means Regionally Significant Infrastructure, including...'	Amend the definition of "Regionally Significant Infrastructure" as follows: Regionally Significant Infrastructure means regionally significant infrastructure including includes: ... k. Defence Facilities	Reject	No	101.7	Oppose	Considers that the definition matches the definition in the GWRC Natural Resources Plan which was settled following mediation of appeals. It is widely accepted and does not need the refinement requested.	Disallow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY	83.1	Support	Oranga Tamariki support the inclusion of the definition which is consistent with the National Planning Standard. Oranga Tamariki considers that it encompasses a range of Oranga Tamariki homes including those with custodial and/or supervised living	Retain definition of Residential Activity as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

			accommodation where the residents may be detained on site.							
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY	83.2	Amend	Oranga Tamariki request that the 'Supported Residential Care Activity' be nested within the residential activity definition. The inclusion of 'Supported Residential Care Activity' and its definition further refines a specific sub-set of residential activity. Oranga Tamariki considers that it could encompass Oranga Tamariki homes and should be nested within the residential activity definition to enable the residential policy framework to apply to this activity.	Seeks that the definition of "Supported Residential Care Activity" be nested within the definition of "Residential Activities".	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY	240.6	Support	Considers that the definition is consistent with the wording provided for in the National Planning Standards. This definition applies to supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama. Providing reintegration and rehabilitation support is an important component of the reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. It enables people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety	Retain the definition of "residential activity" as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY	273.15	Support	Supports the definition of "residential activity" as it includes the use of land and buildings that are primarily purposed for living accommodation.	Retain the definition of "residential activity" as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITY	297.8	Support	Supports the definition of residential activity.	Retain the definition for 'residential activity' as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESIDENTIAL UNIT	273.16	Support	Supports the definition of "residential unit" as it includes the use of a building or part of a building as forming part of a residential unit, one or more residential units, used or intended to be used for a residential activity.	Retain the definition of "residential unit" as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RESIDENTIAL VISITOR ACCOMMODATION	126.5	Amend	Considers that the distinction visitor accommodation and residential visitor accommodation should be clarified as the former appears to encompass the latter.	Clarify the distinction between visitor accommodation and residential visitor accommodation.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RETIREMENT VILLAGE	413.2	Support in part	Supports a broad definition of retirement village.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RETIREMENT VILLAGE	413.3	Amend	Considers it should be recognised that given the economic conditions and changing nature of society, there are some limited circumstances where residents wish to or are required to work and are therefore not "retired". A minor amendment is proposed to reflect this.	Seeks to amend the definition of "retirement village" as follows: "residential accommodation for people who are predominately retired and any spouses or partners of such people. It may also include any of the following for residents within the complex: recreation, leisure, supported residential care, welfare and medical facilities	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				(inclusive of hospital care) and other non-residential activities.”						
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REVERSE SENSITIVITY	228.11	Support	Considers the definition accurately describes the concept of reverse sensitivity and will be helpful to users of the plan.	Retain the definition of 'Reverse Sensitivity' as notified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REVERSE SENSITIVITY	315.33	Support	Supports the provision of a definition as the concept recognises the relationship between existing activities and incompatible new or altered activities. The term is used within the INF chapter within INF- O3 and INF-P7 and is of specific relevance to the National Grid.	Retain the definition of Reverse Sensitivity as notified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REVERSE SENSITIVITY	370.33	Support	Support the definition of reverse sensitivity as it provides for the operation of an existing lawfully established activity (state highway network) to be compromised, constrained or curtailed by the more recent establishment or alteration of another activity which may be sensitive to the actual, potential or perceived environmental effects generated by the existing activity.	Retain the definition of 'Reverse Sensitivity' as notified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions /REVERSE SENSITIVITY	402.27	Support	Supports the intent of this definition.	Retain the definition of 'Reverse Sensitivity' as notified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REVERSE SENSITIVITY	406.42	Support	The definition provides a consistent interpretation and application of the concept of reverse sensitivity.	Retain definition of "REVERSE SENSITIVITY" as notified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / REVERSE SENSITIVITY	408.15	Amend	Supports the definition proposed in relation to reverse sensitivity effects. It is important to recognise the vulnerability of existing, lawfully established activities, such as the rail network, to noise sensitive activities being located nearby. However, the definition needs to recognise that rail activities are more than operation of the railway, also encompassing development, upgrading and maintenance of the railway network.	Amend definition of REVERSE SENSITIVITY as follows: means the potential for the <u>development, upgrading, operation and maintenance</u> of an existing lawfully established activity to be compromised, constrained or curtailed by the more recent establishment or alteration of another activity which may be sensitive to the actual, potential or perceived environmental effects generated by the existing activity.	Accept	Yes	44.17	Oppose	Considers that the proposed additions of 'development' 'upgrading' and 'maintenance' are too broad to be part of the reverse sensitivity definition.	Disallow
							101.8	Support	Considers that it is appropriate to protect minor upgrading and maintenance of existing activities from reverse sensitivity effects.	Allow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	228.12	Support	Considers the definition accurately identifies land use activities that are sensitive to adverse amenity effects including noise.	Retain the definition of 'Sensitive Activity' as notified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	314.7	Oppose	Considers that the definition of 'Sensitive Activity' should be clarified to outline the criteria which define why and how an un-named activity may be sensitive. The definition only provide a list of uses or activities. This approach is inconsistent with the effects-based approach required to be taken in Part 2 of the Resource Management Act.	Clarify the definition of 'Sensitive Activity' to provide a set of criteria defining why and how an un-named activity may be sensitive.	Reject	No	101.9	Oppose	Considers that camping grounds and all forms of temporary accommodation are potentially sensitive in relation to noise effects and should not be excluded from the definition. In the absence of any specific wording proposal, Meridian does not support the inclusion of criteria.	Disallow

Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	314.8	Oppose in part	Considers that the definition of sensitive activity should not include 'visitor accommodation'. A subcategory that excludes campgrounds from sensitive and hazard sensitive activities should be added to the definition. Reason being, camping grounds are transitory in nature and provide for accommodation on a temporary basis. People enjoy camping in areas with natural scenery and landscapes as well as in areas close to the central business centres. The effects can be moderated easily through more specific site management efforts as many of the activities are not permanently attached to the land. People can be moved easily and forewarned in the event of a potential risk or natural hazard. The New Zealand Motor Caravan Association operates over 47 parks across New Zealand, most of which are not categorised as a sensitive activity or hazard sensitive activity.	Amend the definition of 'Sensitive Activity' to remove the mention of visitor accommodation.	Reject	No	101.10	Oppose	Considers that camping grounds and all forms of temporary accommodation are potentially sensitive in relation to noise effects and should not be excluded from the definition. In the absence of any specific wording proposal, Meridian does not support the inclusion of criteria.	Disallow Seeks the requested exclusion of camping grounds or temporary accommodation is disallowed. Seeks the request to include criteria is disallowed.
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	315.34	Support	[No specific reason provided beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain the definition of Sensitive Activity as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	370.34	Support	Supports the definition of sensitive activity.	Retain the definition of 'Sensitive Activity' as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	372.19	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain the Definition of 'Sensitive Activity' as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	400.10	Support	Supports the inclusion of educational facilities in the definition as it aims to protect educational facilities.	Retain the definition of [Sensitive Activity] as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	408.16	Support	Supports activities listed within this definition.	Retain definition of SENSITIVE ACTIVITY as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / STRUCTURE	273.17	Support	Supports the definition of "structure" as it best defines buildings that are fixed/located on land.	Retain the definition of "structure" as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL CARE ACTIVITY	83.3	Amend	It is further considered that the definition should be completed by including "is provided" as it currently reads incomplete.	Amend definition of "Supported Residential Care Activity" as follows: means land and buildings in which residential accommodation, supervision, assistance, care and/or support by another person or agency for residents. is provided	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL CARE ACTIVITY	240.7	Oppose	Considers that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama. That is, supported and transitional accommodation activities use "land and building(s) for people's living accommodation" (as per the definition of "residential activity"). As such, there is no need for a separate and standalone definition of "supported residential care activity" and the	Remove the definition of "supported residential care activity" and the associated provisions applying to it throughout the plan.	Reject	No	89.4	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama. That is, supported and transitional accommodation activities use "land and building(s) for people's living accommodation" (as per the definition of "residential activity").	Disallow

			associated provisions applying to such throughout the PDP.						As such, there is no need for a separate and standalone definition of “supported residential care activity” and the associated provisions applying to such throughout the PDP.	
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL CARE ACTIVITY	240.8	Support in part	Considers that there is no need for a separate and standalone definition of “supported residential care activity” and the associated provisions applying to such throughout the PDP. However, if this is retained, the wording is acceptable.	If the definition of 'supported residential care activity' remained in the Proposed District Plan, retain the wording as notified.	Accept	No	89.5	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the deletion of the 'Supported Residential Care' definition as it is uncertain how the deletion of the definition would affect existing activities that fall within this definition.	Disallow
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL CARE ACTIVITY	350.8	Oppose in part	Notes that the definition of 'retirement village' includes the provision of 'supported residential care' within the village. However, retirement villages are regulated separately from 'supported residential care' and therefore retirement villages should be excluded from the definition. Notes that the definition for 'supported residential care' as currently drafted appears to be incomplete.	Opposes the definition of SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL CARE ACTIVITY and seeks amendment.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL CARE ACTIVITY	350.9	Amend	Notes that the definition of 'retirement village' includes the provision of 'supported residential care' within the village. However, retirement villages are regulated separately from 'supported residential care' and therefore retirement villages should be excluded from the definition. Notes that the definition for 'supported residential care' as currently drafted appears to be incomplete.	Amend the definition of SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL CARE ACTIVITY as follows: means land and buildings in which residential accommodation, supervision, assistance, care and/or support <u>is provided</u> by another person or agency for residents <u>excluding retirement village</u> s.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / VISITOR ACCOMMODATION	126.6	Amend	Considers that the distinction visitor accommodation and residential visitor accommodation should be clarified as the former appears to encompass the latter.	Clarify the distinction between visitor accommodation and residential visitor accommodation.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / VISITOR ACCOMMODATION	314.9	Amend	Considers that the definition of 'Visitor accommodation' should include campgrounds as this could achieve their desired outcome of campgrounds being a permitted activity in the zones.	Amend the definition of 'Visitor Accommodation' to include campgrounds.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WELL-FUNCTIONING URBAN ENVIRONMENT	350.10	Oppose	Opposes the definition of 'well functioning urban environment'. Considers that while it is recognised that Policy 1 of the NPS-UD provides a description of what constitutes a well-functioning urban environment, it is inappropriate to include it as a definition when it is intended to be a Policy and drafted as such. Considers it will lead to interpretation issues and uncertainty when the Plan is applied.	Delete definition WELL-FUNCTIONING URBAN ENVIRONMENT in its entirety as notified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / WELL-FUNCTIONING URBAN ENVIRONMENT	482.25	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend the definition of WELL-FUNCTIONING URBAN ENVIRONMENTS to include mixed uses that support daily requirements, such as fresh food shops, and other services within a 15 minute walking catchment.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B - Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future

Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers rec For reasons see body of report	Changes to PDP?	Further Sub No / Point No	Position	Reasons for Support or Opposition	Decisions Requested
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / General AW	Yvonne Weeber	340.5	Support	[General] The Anga Whakamua – Moving into the future chapter is supported.	Retain the 'Anga Whakamua – Moving into the future' chapter as notified.	Accept in part	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / General AW	Guardians of the Bays	452.4	Support	Supports the Strategic Direction provisions in Anga Whakamua – Moving into the future chapter.	Retain the Anga Whakamua chapter as notified.	Accept in part	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / New AW	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.52	Amend	Considers it appropriate to have regard to Policy IM.1 in Proposed RPS Change 1, Greater Wellington considers that the objectives in 'Anga Whakamua – Moving into the future' should acknowledge the need for data and information availability in resource management decisions.	Add a new Objective to the 'Anga Whakamua Moving into the future' chapter to require resource management decisions to be made making use of best available information and mātauranga Māori.	Accept	Yes				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O1	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.53	Support	Supports objective AW-O1 as it aligns with Policies FW.3 and UD.1 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain Objective AW-O1 as notified.	Accept	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O1	Waka Kotahi	370.44	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written.	Retain Strategic Objective AW-O1 (Resource management processes include mana whenua...) as notified.	Accept	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O1	Taranaki Whānui kite Upoko o te Ika	389.28	Support in part	Supports in principle AW-O1. Considers that submitter has been engaged throughout the process and contributed to the development of these provisions.	Retain Objective AW-O1 as notified.	Accept	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O1	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.43	Support	Objective AW-O1 is generally supported.	Retain Objective AW-O1 (Resource management processes include mana whenua...) as notified.	Accept	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O1	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.12	Support	Supports the intent of AW-O1.	Retain AW-O1 (Resource management processes include mana whenua as active participants...) as notified.	Accept	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O1	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.11	Support in part	Supports the chapter provisions.	Retain AW-O1 (Resource management processes include mana whenua as active participants) as notified, subject to amendments to AW-O3 (Mana whenua can exercise their	Accept in part	No				

					customary responsibilities as mana whenua...) in subsequent submission points						
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O2	Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.10	Support	Supports AW-O2, as it gives recognition to Tangata Whenua and the relationship they have with their lands and traditions. While Treaty Settlement references are not relevant to Tapu-te-Ranga, mention of the use and development of all other land to support aspirations of Tangata Whenua is acknowledged as supporting the Trust's land development aspirations and those of wider Māori populations.	Retain AW-O2 (The relationship of Tangata Whenua with their lands and traditions is recognised and provided for) as notified.	Accept in part	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O2	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.54	Support	Supports objective AW-O2 as it aligns with Policies FW.3 and UD.1 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain Objective AW-O2 as notified.	Accept in part	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O2	Wellington Tenth's Trust	363.1	Support	Supports AW-O2 on the basis that it provides for the development of its future aspirations.	Retain AW-O2 as notified.	Accept in part	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O2	Waka Kotahi	370.45	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written.	Retain Strategic Objective AW-O2 (The relationship of Tangata Whenua with their lands...) as notified.	Accept in part	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O2	WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.14	Amend	Considers the objective unclear.	Seeks additional language to clarify strategic direction for the use development and expansion of land.	Accept in part					
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O2	Taranaki Whānui kite Upoko o te Ika	389.29	Support in part	Supports in principle AW-O2. Considers that submitter has been engaged throughout the process and contributed to the development of these provisions.	Retain Objective AW-O2 as notified.	Accept in part	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O2	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.44	Support	Objective AW-O2 is generally supported.	Retain Objective AW-O2 (The relationship of Tangata Whenua with their lands...) as notified.	Accept in part	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O2	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.13	Support	Supports the intent of AW-O2.	Retain AW-O2 (The relationship of Tangata Whenua with their lands and traditions is recognised...) as notified.	Accept in part	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O2	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.12	Support in part	Supports the chapter provisions.	Retain AW-O2 (The relationship of Tangata Whenua with their lands and traditions is recognised and provided for...) as notified, subject to amendments to AW-O3 (Accept in part	No				

					Mana whenua can exercise their customary responsibilities as mana whenua...) in subsequent submission points						
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O3	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.55	Support	Supports objective AW-O3 as it aligns with Policies FW.3 and UD.1 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain Objective AW-O3 as notified.	Accept	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O3	Waka Kotahi	370.46	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written.	Retain Strategic Objective AW-O3 (Mana whenua can exercise their customary responsibilities...) as notified.	Accept	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O3	Taranaki Whānui kite Upoko o te Ika	389.30	Support	Supports in principle AW-O3. Considers that submitter has been engaged throughout the process and contributed to the development of these provisions.	Retain Objective AW-O3 as notified.	Accept	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O3	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.45	Support	Objective AW-O3 is generally supported.	Retain Objective AW-O3 (Mana whenua can exercise their customary...) as notified.	Accept	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O3	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.14	Support	Supports the intent of AW-O3.	Retain AW-O3 (Mana whenua can exercise their customary responsibilities...) as notified.	Accept	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O3	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.13	Amend	Considers the provisions need amending to strengthen and uphold iwi values.	Amend AW-O3 (Mana whenua can exercise their customary responsibilities as mana whenua...) to: Mana whenua can exercise their customary responsibilities as mana whenua and kaitiaki with their own mātauranga Māori.	Reject	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O4	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.56	Support	Supports objective AW-O4 as it aligns with Policies FW.3 and UD.1 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain Objective AW-O4 as notified.	Accept	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O4	Waka Kotahi	370.47	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written.	Retain Strategic Objective AW-O4 (The development and design of the City reflects...) as notified.	Accept	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O4	Taranaki Whānui kite Upoko o te Ika	389.31	Support	Supports in principle AW-O4. Considers that submitter has been engaged throughout the process and contributed to the development of these provisions.	Retain Objective AW-O4 as notified.	Accept	No				

Appendix B - Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future

Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O4	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.46	Support	Objective AW-O4 is generally supported.	Retain Objective AW-O4 (The development and design of the City...) as notified.	Accept	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O4	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.15	Support	Supports the intent of AW-O4.	Retain AW-O4 (The development and design of the City reflects mana whenua...) as notified.	Accept	No				
Strategic Direction / Anga Whakamua Moving into the future / AW-O4	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.14	Support in part	Supports the chapter provisions.	Retain AW-O4 (The development and design of the City reflects mana whenua and the contribution of their culture...) as notified, subject to amendments to AW-O3 (Mana whenua can exercise their customary responsibilities as mana whenua...) in subsequent submission points	Accept in part	No				

Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers' rec For reasons see body of report	Changes to PDP?	Further Sub No / Point No	Position	Reasons for Support or Opposition	Decisions Requested
Strategic Direction / Capital City / General CC	Yvonne Weeber	340.6	Not specified	[No specific reason given - refer to original submission].	Not specified.	-	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / General CC	Restaurant Brands Limited	349.5	Support	Support	Retain CC – Tāone Kāwana - Capital City as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / General CC	Guardians of the Bays	452.5	Not specified	The submitter is neutral regarding the Strategic Direction provisions in Capital City chapter.	Retain the Capital City Chapter as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O1	Waka Kotahi	370.48	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written and notes that these objectives align with the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2021/22-2030/31 (GPS)	Retain Strategic Objective CC-O1 (Wellington City continues to be the primary economic...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O1	Wellington Civic Trust	388.6	Support	Objective CC-O1 is generally supported.	Retain Capital City Objective CC-O1 as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O1	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.47	Support	Objective CC-O1 is generally supported.	Retain Objective CC-O1 (Wellington City continues to be the primary...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O1	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.16	Support	Supports the intent of CC-O1.	Retain CC-O1 (Wellington City continues to be the primary economic and employment hub...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.21	Support	Considers that the Council has correctly identified the residential area of the land as an appropriate location to deliver urban intensification which will build on the existing urban form with quality developments.	Retain CC-O2 (Wellington City is a well-functioning Capital City where...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.11	Support in part	Supports CC-O2's provisions for the social, cultural, economic and environmental wellbeing of current and future residents (2), and the delivery of urban intensification in appropriate locations and in a manner that meets the needs of current and future generations (3). Opposes (3) and (6) to the extent those provisions are inconsistent with providing for urban intensification across Wellington City.	Retain CC-O2 (Strategic Objectives) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.12	Amend	Supports CC-O2's provisions for the social, cultural, economic and environmental wellbeing of current and future residents (2), and the delivery of urban intensification in appropriate locations and in a manner that meets the needs of current and future generations (3). Opposes (3) and (6) to the extent those provisions are inconsistent with providing for urban intensification across Wellington City.	Seeks amendment CC-O2 (Strategic Objectives) so that the wording in (3) and (6) is consistent with providing for urban intensification across Wellington City.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Waka Kotahi	370.49	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written and notes that these objectives align with the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2021/22-2030/31 (GPS)	Retain Strategic Objective CC-O2 (Wellington City is a well-functioning Capital City...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.15	Amend	Considers the phrase "environmental wellbeing" is considered ambiguous.	Amend CC-O2 (Wellington City Council is a well-functioning Capital City where...) as follows: 2. Current and future residents can meet their social, cultural and economic and environmental wellbeing and the environment is protected and enhanced. 5. Innovation and technology advances that support the social, cultural and economic and environmental wellbeing of existing and future residents are promoted and the environment is protected and enhanced.	Accept in part	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.9	Support	Supports a Wellington City being a well-functioning Capital City where urban intensification is delivered in appropriate locations. Supports recognition that the Wellington CBD is an economic hub and appropriate intensification and development should be enabled to provide for well-functioning urban environments	Retain Objective CC-O2 as notified	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Wellington Civic Trust	388.7	Support	Objective CC-O2 is generally supported.	Retain Capital City Objective CC-O2 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.32	Support in part	Support CC-O2(3).	Clarify how CC-O2(3) will be implemented.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.33	Amend	Considers that implementation could include better cross-referencing throughout the whole plan back to CC-O2 strategic objective. The primacy, prominence and presence of Taranaki Whānui cultural visibility incorporated in all design and development proposals.	Seeks that the whole plan refers back to CC-O2.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.48	Support in part	Objective CC-O2 is partially supported, and an amendment is sought so the objective is not overly constraining of where urban intensification can occur.	Retain Objective CC-O2 (Wellington City is a well-functioning...) with amendment.	Reject	No	36.21	Oppose	WIAL considers that it is appropriate for the objective to qualify that intensification will only occur within "appropriate locations". What is "appropriate" or "inappropriate" is subsequently defined by objectives, policies and overlays identified in the Proposed Plan (such as the Air Noise Boundary).	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.49	Amend	Considers that Objective CC-O2 is too restrictive of where urban intensification can occur and should be amended.	Amend Objective CC-O2 (Wellington City is a well-functioning...) as follows: Wellington City is a well-functioning Capital City where: ... 4. Urban intensification is delivered in appropriate locations and in a manner that meets the needs of current and future generations. ...	Reject	No	36.22	Oppose	WIAL considers that it is appropriate for the objective to qualify that intensification will only occur within "appropriate locations". What is "appropriate" or "inappropriate" is subsequently defined by objectives, policies and overlays identified in the Proposed Plan (such as the Air Noise Boundary).	Disallow
								70.49	Oppose	Urban development and intensification in inappropriate locations could reduce the resilience of a community from natural hazards and the effects of climate change, and reduces the livability and sustainability of cities in the long term. It is important that the WCC proposed plan specifies that urban intensification occur only in appropriate areas.	Disallow

								74.27	Oppose	Considers that the proposed amendment is contrary to NPS-UD and MDRS. It is common sense that intensification ought to occur in appropriate locations.	Disallow
								80.15	Oppose	Considers an important principle of District Planning is to identify appropriate locations for densification.	Disallow
								82.111	Oppose	Considers the proposed amendment is contrary to the NPS-UD and MDRS. Considers that it is 'common sense' that intensification ought to occur in appropriate locations.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.22	Amend	Considers that text from the introduction of the Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter should be added to CC-O2.	Amend CC-O2 as follows: Wellington City is a well-functioning Capital City where: ... 4. Urban intensification is delivered in appropriate locations and in a manner that meets the needs of current and future generations. <u>and recognises that Historic Heritage is a key contributor to the City's vibrancy and sense of place.</u>	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.23	Amend	Considers that wording from elsewhere in the plan should be integrated.	Amend CC-O2 as follows: Wellington City is a well-functioning Capital City where: ... 6. Values and characteristics that are an important part of the City's identity and sense of place, <u>including historic heritage, the natural environment and sites and areas of significance to mana whenua,</u> are identified and protected."	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O2	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.17	Support	Supports the intent of CC-O2.	Retain CC-O2 (Wellington City is a well-functioning Capital City where...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O3	Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.22	Support	Considers that the Council has correctly identified the residential area of the land as an appropriate location to deliver urban intensification which will build on the existing urban form with quality developments.	Retain CC-O3 (Development is consistent with and supports the achievement of the strategic city objectives...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O3	Waka Kotahi	370.50	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written and notes that these objectives align with the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2021/22-2030/31 (GPS)	Retain Strategic Objective CC-O3 (Development is consistent with and supports...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O3	Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.10	Support	Supports development that is consistent with and supports the achievement of strategic city objectives. Supports recognition that the Wellington CBD is an economic hub and appropriate intensification and development should be enabled to provide for well-functioning urban environments	Retain Objective CC-O3 as notified	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-O3	Wellington Civic Trust	388.8	Support	Objective CC-O3 is supported, in particular for its sub-points: CC03-2, a resilient city through good design; CC03-4, with a particular emphasis on	Retain Capital City Objective CC-O3 as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				comprehensive movement systems and attractive and accessible public spaces and streets; and CC03-05, with the emphasis on a greener city with the natural environment being protected, enhanced and integrated into the City's urban environment.							
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-03	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.34	Support	Support CC-03 (6).	Clarify how CC-03(6) will be implemented.	Accept in part		NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-03	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.50	Support	Objective CC-03 is generally supported.	Retain Objective CC-03 (Development is consistent with and supports...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-03	Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.24	Amend	Considers that Wellington's character areas and heritage buildings have been evolving over more than a hundred and fifty years relative to the city's topography, to light and climate and to people's needs and that it is important that new development respects this.	Amend CC-03 as follows: Development is consistent with and supports the achievement of the following strategic city objectives: 1. Compact: Wellington builds on its existing urban form with quality development in the right locations <u>that respect character areas and historic heritage</u> ;	Reject		NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Capital City / CC-03	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.18	Support	Supports the intent of CC-03.	Retain CC-03 (Development is consistent with and supports the achievement...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers' rec For reasons see body of report	Changes to PDP?	Further Sub No / Point No	Position	Reasons for Support or Opposition	Decisions Requested
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / General CEKP	Richard Murcott	322.13	Oppose	Considers that an enduring, prosperous city will be a liveable city that values character and heritage, and be successful at getting this balance right. Considers that the PDP is attempting to achieve or enable both a solution for the need for more housing as well as encouraging more affordable housing, including by the removal of panning protections in character neighbourhoods. The extent to which blanket upzoning of character and heritage zoning will provide any solution for affordable housing is doubtful because high land values in Thorndon mean private developments will be high-priced. Considers that the PDP is confusing and feels like an inappropriate response to the problem. It is a response that jeopardises aspects of areas of residential Thorndon that are highly desirable and valued by the community, city and nation (especially being in the Capital). The PDP is not adequately protecting the uniqueness of the city (i.e. significant parts of residential Thorndon has protections removed by this PDP). Considers that as it stands, the PDP may allow unintended consequences, and this is avoidable. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that the Council changes the incentives for significant property owners in the city to improve existing land use, by using levers outside of the District Plan and recognises the values of the character of the inner residential suburbs.	Addressed in 'underutilized land' submissions analysis Reject in part	Addressed in 'underutilized land' submissions analysis No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / General CEKP	Yvonne Weeber	340.7	Amend	Considers that the CEKP chapter should reference the need to change our present economic model to reduce climate change.	Seeks that the 'City Economy, Knowledge and Prosperity' chapter reference the need to change the current economic model to reduce climate change.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / General CEKP	Restaurant Brands Limited	349.6	Support	Support	Retain CEKP – Te Ohaoha, Mōhiotanga me te Taurikura ā-Tāone - City Economy, Knowledge and Prosperity as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / General CEKP	Guardians of the Bays	452.6	Amend	The Strategic Direction- City Economy, Knowledge and Prosperity chapter needs to reference the need to change our present economic model to reduce climate change.	Seeks that the City Economy, Knowledge and Prosperity chapter is amended to incorporate references to the need to change our present economic model to reduce climate change	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / New CEKP	Horokiwi Quarries Ltd	271.16	Amend	Considers that there is an absence of policy recognition within the PDP of a new quarry site, or expansion of an existing site outside the Quarry Zone. Given the importance of quarries to the city and region, Horokiwi would support policy recognition outside the Special Purpose Quarry zone, and specific to the strategic objectives, the provision of a strategic objective which recognises the benefits of mineral utilisation. Such a policy would be consistent with the Greater Wellington Regional Council Proposed Natural Resources Plan Policy 12A, and the Regional Policy Statement Policy 60.	Add new strategic objective as follows: <u>CEKP-06:</u> <u>When considering proposals that relate to the use of the Region's mineral resources, particular regard will be given to the benefits from the utilisation of those resources in the form of quarrying activities.</u>	Addressed in SCA	Addressed in SCA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O1	Woolworths New Zealand	359.9	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain Objective CEKP-O1 (A range of commercial and mixed use environments...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O1	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.51	Support	Objective CEKP-O1 is generally supported.	Retain Objective CEKP-O1 (A range of commercial and mixed use environments...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O1	Investore Property Limited	405.25	Support	Supports the provision of a range of commercial and mixed-use environments. The NPS-UD requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Retain CEKP-O1 (Strategic Objectives) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O1	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.49	Support in part	Considers that modern airports now demand a mix of land uses that either directly service the aviation sector, or feed directly off it. Focus is also increasingly being placed on improving airport revenue to offset operational costs. While it is conceivable that consideration of such activities is contemplated by Objectives CEKP-O1 and CEKP-O3 to O4, WIAL submits that the relevance of these objectives to the Airport Zone should be clearly stated. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15, 4.20 to 4.24 for full reason]	Retain CEKP-O1 (Strategic Objectives) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O1	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.19	Support	Supports the intent of CEKP-O1.	Retain CEKP-O1 (A range of commercial and mixed use environments are provided...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O1	Stride Investment Management Limited	470.9	Support	Supports CEKP-O1 (A range of commercial and mixed use environments...).	Retain as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Woolworths New Zealand	359.10	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that objectives and rationale in the CEKP chapter are concerning, as there is not sufficient information to determine whether the PDP achieves its growth objectives, namely UFD-O5 which states "sufficient land development capacity is available to meet the short-, medium- and long-term business land needs of the City, as identified in the Wellington Regional Housing and Business Capacity Assessment."</p> <p>The PDP states that it has been prepared based on the Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment – which cites that "the City will require up to 24ha of land that would accommodate 78ha of floor space for future business development and activities over the next 30 years", based on the Council's population growth estimates.</p> <p>The 'supporting documents' page for the PDP provides a link through to the Regional Housing & Business Development Capacity Assessment 2022. A review of this indicates that so far analysis has only been completed with respect to housing development capacity and that a revision of this assessment will include business land but that analysis will not be completed until June 2024, in such time to inform the 2024 Long-Term Plans and a Future Development Strategy for the Wellington Region. Woolworths considers that there appears to be a timeframe misalignment in that the PDP will be adopted prior to the Business Development Capacity Assessment being undertaken and it is unclear therefore how Council has determined that sufficient areas of land within the various commercial and mixed-use zones (including Centres) have been provided for within the PDP. It is assumed that the PDP has been developed in response to the assessment undertaken in 2019 (as referenced in the Retail and Market Assessment - Sense Partners and Colliers November 2020) which identified a requirement for 49,992m2 of retail floorspace to 2047 (noting that this assessment was undertaken prior to the Covid-19 pandemic).</p>	<p>Seeks that more information is provided to determine whether the PDP achieves its own growth objectives in the City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity chapter.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Woolworths New Zealand	359.11	Amend	Considers that the wording in CEKP-O2 should be amended to include passers-by activity. Neighbourhood Centres serve passers-by as well as their immediate residential neighbourhood. This wording is consistent with the current wording proposed in NCZ- P2 “Enable a range of activities that contribute positively to the purpose of the Zone and meet the convenience needs of the immediate neighbourhood and passers-by:” and as such this insertion ensures that the Part 3 NCZ provisions are in line with the matters at Part 2. Amending this objective as such would make it adaptive and responsive to evolving retailing, and achieve the best outcomes for the City and its communities.	Amend Objective CEKP-O2 (The City maintains a hierarchy of centres...) as follows: ... 4. Neighbourhood Centres - these centres service the immediate residential neighbourhood <u>and passers-by</u> and offer <u>generally</u> small-scale convenience-based retail for day-to-day needs. These centres are generally for small commercial clusters and community services. Neighbourhood Centres are accessible by public transport and active transport modes.	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Waka Kotahi	370.51	Amend	Considers this objective should also include a description of the “commercial zone” and spell out expectations around access and connectivity for that zone.	Seeks to include a description of the anticipated role and function of the commercial zone.	Accept in part Addressed in CEKP-O3	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.11	Support	Supports the Centres hierarchy and the recognition of the City Centre as the primary centre for the wider region. Supports the Proposed Plan to the extent that it provides for and supports the vibrancy of the city centre	Retain Objective CEKP-O2 as notified	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.52	Support in part	Objective CEKP-O2 is generally supported.	Retain Objective CEKP-O2 (The City maintains a hierarchy of centres...) with amendment.	Reject	No	36.23	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that it is not clear where the “town centres” are located and the extent to which these may / may not be located within the Air Noise Boundary of 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary for Wellington International Airport.	Disallow Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.53	Amend	Considers that Objective CEKP-O2 should be amended to introduce the Town Centre Zone within the centres hierarchy and differentiates between the scale, role and function of Town and Local Centres to achieve consistency with the National Planning Standards, and better reflect growth outcomes and the role and function of centres within the urban environment.	Amend Objective CEKP-O2 (The City maintains a hierarchy of centres...) as follows: The City maintains a hierarchy of centres based on their role and function, as follows: ... <u>3. Town Centres – these centres service the surrounding suburbs. Town centres contain a range of commercial, community, recreational and entertainment activities. Town Centres are well-connected to the City’s public transport network and active transport modes are also provided for. Town Centres will play a role in accommodating and servicing the needs of the existing and forecast population growth that is complementary to the City</u>	Reject	No	36.24	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that it is not clear where the “town centres” are located and the extent to which these may / may not be located within the Air Noise Boundary of 60dB Ldn Noise Boundary for Wellington International Airport.	Disallow Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.
								82.135	Oppose	Whether a particular centre services neighbouring suburbs is a key distinction between local centres and neighbourhood centres which ought to be preserved in the plan framework and centres hierarchy.	Disallow
								84.27	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless	Disallow Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.

				<p><u>Centre and Metropolitan Centre Zones. This intensification is due to the capacity of the area to absorb more high-density housing with enablers of growth such as offering a walkable access to public transport, community facilities and services; and</u></p> <p>3.4. Local Centres – these centres service the surrounding residential catchment and neighbouring suburbs. Local Centres contain a range of commercial, community, recreational and entertainment activities. Local Centres are well-connected to the City’s public transport network and active transport modes are also provided for. Local Centres will play a role in accommodating and servicing the needs of the existing and forecast population growth that is complementary to the City Centre, and Metropolitan Centre, and <u>Town Centre</u> Zones. This intensification is due to the capacity of the area to absorb more <u>medium density</u> housing with enablers of growth such as walkable access to public transport, and community facilities and services and;</p> <p><u>4.5. Neighbourhood Centres - ...</u></p>					there is investment in associated infrastructure.	
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Investore Property Limited	405.26	Support	<p>Supports the recognition of the regional significance of the Metropolitan Centres of Johnsonville and Kilbirnie under CEKP-O2 as major live-work hubs,</p> <p>The NPS-UD requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments [Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Retain CEKP-O2 (Strategic Objectives) as notified.	Accept	No			

Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.20	Support	Supports the intent of CEKP-O2.	Retain CEKP-O2 (The City maintains a hierarchy of centres based on their role and function...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	Stride Investment Management Limited	470.10	Support	Supports CEKP-O2 (The City maintains a hierarchy of centres based on their role..).	Retain as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O2	The Thorndon Society Inc	487.1	Amend	Considers that business activities should be constrained to the City Centre to keep the city vibrant and to restrict businesses from pushing out residential accommodation	Amend CEKP-O2 (The City maintains a heirarchy of centres ...) as follows: ... 2. Metropolitan Centres ... Intensification for housing and business needs will be enabled in these locations, to complement the City Centre; Local Centres ...	Reject	No	111.74	Support	No specific reason provided.	Allow
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Woolworths New Zealand	359.12	Amend	Considers that the wording in CEKP-O3 should be amended to enable a centres plus approach, by contemplating commercial activities outside of the Centres zones and beyond the Mixed Use and Industrial zones as currently proposed. This amendment now accommodates the inclusion of these activities in the Commercial zone and Residential zones – both of which contemplate commercial activities by way of restricted discretionary and discretionary consenting pathways and as such ensures that the Part 3 provisions are in line with the matters at Part 2.	Amend Objective CEKP-O3 (Mixed use and industrial areas outside of Centres...) as follows: Mixed use and industrial <u>Development of</u> areas outside of Centres: 1. Complement the hierarchy of Centres; 2. Provide for activities that are incompatible with other Centres-based activities; and Support large scale <u>commercial</u> , industrial and service-based activities that serve the needs of the City and wider region.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.54	Support	Objective CEKP-O3 is generally supported.	Retain Objective CEKP-O3 (Mixed use and industrial areas outside of Centres:...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.50	Support in part	<p>Considers that modern airports now demand a mix of land uses that either directly service the aviation sector, or feed directly off it. Focus is also increasingly being placed on improving airport revenue to offset operational costs.</p> <p>While it is conceivable that consideration of such activities is contemplated by Objectives CEKP-O1 and CEKP-O3 to O4, WIAL submits that the relevance of these objectives to the Airport Zone should be clearly stated.</p> <p>[See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15, 4.20 to 4.24 for full reason]</p>	Retain CEKP-O3 (Strategic Objectives) with amendments.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.51	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that modern airports now demand a mix of land uses that either directly service the aviation sector, or feed directly off it. Focus is also increasingly being placed on improving airport revenue to offset operational costs.</p> <p>While it is conceivable that consideration of such activities is contemplated by Objectives CEKP-O1 and CEKP-O3 to O4, WIAL submits that the relevance of these objectives to the Airport Zone should be clearly stated.</p> <p>[See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15, 4.20 to 4.24 for full reason]</p>	Delete CEKP-O3 (Strategic Objectives) (Option A).	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.52	Amend	<p>Considers that modern airports now demand a mix of land uses that either directly service the aviation sector, or feed directly off it. Focus is also increasingly being placed on improving airport revenue to offset operational costs.</p> <p>While it is conceivable that consideration of such activities is contemplated by Objectives CEKP-O1 and CEKP-O3 to O4, WIAL submits that the relevance of these objectives to the Airport Zone should be clearly stated.</p> <p>[See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15, 4.20 to 4.24 for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend CEKP-O3 (Strategic Objectives) as follows:</p> <p>Mixed use and industrial areas outside of Centres, <u>including within the Airport Zone</u>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complement the hierarchy of Centres; 2. Provide for activities that are incompatible with other Centres-based activities; and <p>Support large scale industrial and service-based activities that serve the needs of the City, the Airport and wider region. (Option B).</p>	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O3	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.21	Support	Supports the intent of CEKP-O3.	Retain CEKP-O3 (Mixed use and industrial areas outside of Centres...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Woolworths New Zealand	359.13	Amend	Considers that the wording in CEKP-O4 should be amended to ensure that activities that have an operational and functional need can locate within the City Centre, Centres, Mixed Use, and General Industrial Zones while still protecting the City's hierarchy of centres. The removal of the term 'undermine' and replacement with a focus on avoiding adverse effects relative to the vibrancy, function and amenity of centres is consistent with the language used in the policies of the Centre Zones. As such, it ensures that the Part 3 provisions are in line with the matters at Part 2.	Amend Objective CEKP-O4 (Land within the City Centre, Centres, Mixed Use,...) as follows: Land within the City Centre, Centres, Mixed Use, and General Industrial Zones is protected from activities that <u>do not demonstrate an operational or functional need to locate within the zone</u> ; are incompatible with the purpose of the zone; or <u>have the potential to undermine adversely affect the vibrancy, function and amenity of the centre within the City's hierarchy of centres.</u>	Reject in part		NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.12	Support	Supports land within the City Centre being protected from activities that are incompatible with the purpose of the zone or have the potential to undermine the City's hierarchy of centres. Supports the Proposed Plan to the extent that it provides for and supports the vibrancy of the city centre	Retain Objective CEKP-O4 as notified	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.55	Support	Objective CEKP-O5 is generally supported.	Retain Objective CEKP-O5 (Strategically important assets including those that support Māori culture,...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.53	Oppose in part	Considers that modern airports now demand a mix of land uses that either directly service the aviation sector, or feed directly off it. Focus is also increasingly being placed on improving airport revenue to offset operational costs. While it is conceivable that consideration of such activities is contemplated by Objectives CEKP-O1 and CEKP-O3 to O4, WIAL submits that the relevance of these objectives to the Airport Zone should be clearly stated. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15, 4.20 to 4.24 for full reason]	Retain CEKP-O4 (Strategic Objectives) with amendments.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.54	Oppose in part	Considers that modern airports now demand a mix of land uses that either directly service the aviation sector, or feed directly off it. Focus is also increasingly being placed on improving airport revenue to offset operational costs. While it is conceivable that consideration of such activities is contemplated by Objectives CEKP-O1 and CEKP-O3 to O4, WIAL submits that the relevance of these objectives to the Airport Zone should be clearly stated.	Delete CEKP-O4 (Strategic Objectives) (Option A).	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				[See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15, 4.20 to 4.24 for full reason]							
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.55	Amend	<p>Considers that modern airports now demand a mix of land uses that either directly service the aviation sector, or feed directly off it. Focus is also increasingly being placed on improving airport revenue to offset operational costs.</p> <p>While it is conceivable that consideration of such activities is contemplated by Objectives CEKP-O1 and CEKP-O3 to O4, WIAL submits that the relevance of these objectives to the Airport Zone should be clearly stated.</p> <p>[See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15, 4.20 to 4.24 for full reason]</p>	Amend CEKP-O4 (Strategic Objectives) as follows: Land within the City Centre, Centres, Mixed Use, and General Industrial Zones (including within the Airport Zone) is protected from activities that are incompatible with the purpose of the zone or have the potential to undermine the City's hierarchy of centres. (Option b).	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O4	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.22	Support	Supports the intent of CEKP-O4.	Retain CEKP-O4 (Land within the City Centre, Centres, Mixed Use, and General Industrial Zones is protected...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O5	Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.11	Support	Supports the inclusion of this policy in general as it underpins Māori wellbeing.	Retain Strategic Objective CEKP-O5 (Strategically important assets including those that support Māori culture, tourism, trade, education, research, and health and cultural wellbeing are provided for in appropriate locations) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O5	Aggregate and Quarry Association	303.11	Amend	Considers that CEKP-O5 should make mention quarrying as a strategically important asset.	Amend Strategic Objective 5 in City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity to reference quarrying as a strategically important asset.	Accept in part	Yes	28.2	Support	Given the importance of quarries to the city and region, Horokiwi would support policy recognition outside the Special Purpose Quarry zone, and specific to the strategic objectives, the provision of a strategic objective. Such a policy would be consistent with the Greater Wellington Regional Council Proposed Natural Resources Plan Policy 12A, and the Regional Policy Statement Policy 60.	Allow
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O5	Taranaki Whānui kite Upoko o te Ika	389.35	Support in part	Supports CEKP-O5 in principle Taranaki Whānui have commercial aspirations regarding the planning of the city's future.	Retain CEKP-O5 as notified. [refer to original submission]	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O5	Ministry of Education	400.12	Support	Supports the need for strategically important assets to support education in Wellington.	Retain CEKP-O5 (Strategically important assets) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O5	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.23	Support	Supports the intent of CEKP-O5.	Retain CEKP-O5 (Strategically important assets including those that support Māori culture...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / City Economy Knowledge and Prosperity / CEKP-O5	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.15	Support in part	Supports CEKP-O5 as it references cultural wellbeing.	Retain CEKP-O5 (Strategically important assets including those that support Māori culture...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers' rec For reasons see body of report	Changes to PDP?	Further Sub No / Point No	Position	Reasons for Support or Opposition	Decisions Requested
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General HHSASM	Yvonne Weeber	340.8	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain the 'Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori' chapter as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General HHSASM	WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.16	Amend	Considers that in the introduction it is stated "Often sites [of significance to Maori] no longer exist physically". The submitter considers this to be clumsy wording as sites exist forever. It is the physical evidence that may no longer exist.	Amend the introduction statement as follows: "Often <u>the physical evidence</u> of sites no longer exists physically however their memory and association remains".	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General HHSASM	Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.25	Amend	Considers that Wellington's character areas and heritage buildings play a significant role in the liveability of our city.	Amend the introduction to the Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori chapter as follows: "Historic and cultural heritage provides a connection with those who lived before us. It helps us define who we are and contributes to our sense of place <u>and to the liveability of the City</u> . Once destroyed, it cannot be replaced. It is a fundamental part of the wellbeing of people and communities."	Reject	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / General HHSASM	Guardians of the Bays	452.7	Support	Supports the Strategic Direction provisions in Historic Heritage and Site and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter.	Retain the Historic Heritage and Site and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O1	Waka Kotahi	370.52	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written.	Retain Strategic Objective HHSASM-O1 (Significant buildings, structures, areas, and sites...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O1	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.36	Support in part	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whanui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Retain HHSASM-O1 with amendments.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O1	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.37	Amend	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Seeks amendment to: a) include role of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua or b) that is most appropriate to address the submission.	Reject	No	38.38	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
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O1	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.56	Support	Objective HHSASM-O1 is generally supported.	Retain Objective HHSASM-O1 (Significant buildings, structures, areas,...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O1	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.24	Support in part	Supports HHSASM-O1 in part. Considers that within HHSAM-O2 it should be acknowledged that: - Wellington must achieve a balance between heritage protection and enabling new development; and - heritage buildings, structures, areas and sites must be clearly identified both in order to protect those sites and to provide clarity on where heritage protection does and does not apply.	Retain HHSASM-O1 (Significant buildings, structures, areas, and sites that exemplify Wellington's historical...) as notified. [Support is based on requested amendments to HH-O1 (Recognising historic heritage) and HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage)]	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O1	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.16	Support in part	Supports the chapter provisions which recognize the risk of natural hazards to significant infrastructure but considers that it is important that the plan provides ways to build resilience for significant cultural infrastructure.	Retain HHSASM-O1 (Significant buildings, structures, areas, and sites that exemplify Wellington's historical and cultural values are identified, recognised and protected) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O2	Waka Kotahi	370.53	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written.	Retain Strategic Objective HHSASM-O2 (Built heritage is resilient and has a sustainable long term...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.38	Support in part	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga	Retain HHSASM-O2 with amendments.	Reject	No	38.39	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	Disallow

Māori / HHSASM-O2				on their SASM sites.						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.	
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O2	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.39	Amend	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Seeks amendment to: a) include role of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua or that is most appropriate to address the submission.	Reject	No	38.40	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
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O2	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.57	Support	Objective HHSASM-O2 is generally supported.	Retain Objective HHSASM-O2 (Built heritage is resilient and has a sustainable...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O2	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.25	Support in part	Supports HHSASM-O2 in part. Considers that within HHSAM-O2 it should be acknowledged that: - Wellington must achieve a balance between heritage protection and enabling new development; and - heritage buildings, structures, areas and sites must be clearly identified both in order to protect those sites and to provide clarity on where heritage protection does and does not apply.	Retain HHSASM-O2 (Built heritage is resilient and has a sustainable long term use...) as notified. [Support is based on requested amendments to HH-O1 (Recognising historic heritage) and HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage)]	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O2	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.17	Support in part	Supports the chapter provisions which recognize the risk of natural hazards to significant infrastructure but considers that it is important that the plan provides ways to build resilience for significant cultural infrastructure.	Retain HHSASM-O2 (Built heritage is resilient and has a sustainable long term use while ensuring heritage and cultural values are recognised and maintained) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.12	Support	Supports the recognition of values associated with sites and areas of significance to Māori and the protection of these.	Retain Strategic Objective HHSASM-O3 (The cultural, spiritual and/or historical values associated with sites and areas of significance to Māori are protected) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Waka Kotahi	370.54	Support	Supports these strategic objectives as written.	Retain Strategic Objective HHSASM-O3 (The cultural, spiritual and/or historical values...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.40	Support in part	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Retain HHSASM-O3 with amendments.	Reject	No	38.41	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
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.41	Amend	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Seeks amendment to: a) include role of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua or that is most appropriate to address the submission.	Reject	No	38.42	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	Disallow

										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.	
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.58	Support	Objective HHSASM-O3 is generally supported.	Retain Objective HHSASM-O3 (The cultural, spiritual and/or historical values...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.56	Support in part	Submitter does not oppose in principle areas of significance to Māori being identified. Considers that the objectives and policies that seek to give effect to these objectives provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas, particularly where the site of significance has been heavily modified.	Not Specified	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.57	Oppose	Submitter does not oppose in principle areas of significance to Māori being identified. Considers that the objectives and policies that seek to give effect to these objectives provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas, particularly where the site of significance has been heavily modified.	Delete HHSASM-O3 (Cultural, spiritual and/or historical values) (Option A).	Reject	No	38.83	Oppose	The submitter requests for HHSASM-O3 to be deleted and seeks provisions that give effect to HHSASM-O3 to provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas particularly where the site has been heavily modified. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites. It is inappropriate for SASM objectives to be removed from City's Strategic Direction chapter.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.58	Support in part	Submitter does not oppose in principle areas of significance to Māori being identified. Considers that the objectives and policies that seek to give effect to these objectives provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas, particularly where the site of significance has been heavily modified.	Seeks that any provisions that give effect to HHSASM-O3 (Cultural, spiritual and/or historical values) provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas, particularly where the site has been heavily modified (Option B).	Reject	No	38.84	Oppose	The submitter requests for HHSASM-O3 to be deleted and seeks provisions that give effect to HHSASM-O3 to provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas particularly where the site has been heavily modified. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites. It is inappropriate for SASM objectives to be removed from City's Strategic Direction chapter.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O3	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.18	Support in part	Supports the chapter provisions which recognize the risk of natural hazards to significant infrastructure but considers that it is important that the plan provides ways to build resilience for significant cultural infrastructure.	Retain HHSASM-O3 (The cultural, spiritual and/or historical values associated with sites and areas of significance to Māori are protected) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.13	Support	Supports the recognition of sites of significance and their relationship to mana whenua with interests and associations (including cultural importance). While they are not part of Taranaki Whānui, they appreciate their recognised Mana Whenua status across Wellington.	Retain Strategic Objective HHSASM-O4 (Sites of significance to Māori are identified and mana whenua's relationships...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.42	Support in part	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Retain HHSASM-O4 with amendments.	Reject	No	38.43	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
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.43	Amend	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Seeks amendment to: a) include role of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua or that is most appropriate to address the submission.	Reject	No	39.44	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
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.59	Support	Objective HHSASM-O4 is generally supported.	Retain Objective HHSASM-O4 (Sites of significance to Māori are identified...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.59	Support in part	<p>Submitter does not oppose in principle areas of significance to Māori being identified.</p> <p>Considers that the objectives and policies that seek to give effect to these objectives provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas, particularly where the site of significance has been heavily modified.</p>	Not Specified	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.60	Oppose	<p>Submitter does not oppose in principle areas of significance to Māori being identified.</p> <p>Considers that the objectives and policies that seek to give effect to these objectives provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas, particularly where the site of significance has been heavily modified.</p>	Delete HHSASM-O4 (Cultural, spiritual and/or historical values) (Option A).	Reject	No	38.85	Oppose	The submitter requests HHSASM-O4 to be deleted and seeks provisions that give effect to HHSASM-O4 to provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas particularly where the site has been heavily modified. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites. It is inappropriate for SASM objectives to be removed from City's Strategic Direction chapter.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.61	Support in part	<p>Submitter does not oppose in principle areas of significance to Māori being identified.</p> <p>Considers that the objectives and policies that seek to give effect to these objectives provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas, particularly where the site of significance has been heavily modified.</p>	Seeks that any provisions that give effect to HHSASM-O4 (Cultural, spiritual and/or historical values) provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas, particularly where the site has been heavily modified (Option B).	Reject	No	38.86	Oppose	The submitter requests HHSASM-O4 to be deleted and seeks provisions that give effect to HHSASM-O4 to provide clear guidance around the land use management expectations within these areas particularly where the site has been heavily modified. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because this provision is appropriate and should still apply to heavily modified sites. It is inappropriate for SASM objectives to be removed from City's Strategic Direction chapter.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O4	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.19	Support in part	Supports the chapter provisions which recognize the risk of natural hazards to significant infrastructure but considers that it is important that the plan provides ways to build resilience for significant cultural infrastructure.	Retain HHSASM-O4 (Sites of significance to Māori are identified and mana whenua's relationships, interests and associations with their culture...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-O5	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.44	Support in part	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Retain HHSASM-O5 with amendments.	Reject	No	38.45	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	Disallow

										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.	
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-05	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.45	Amend	Supports the recognition and protection of SASMs and Taranaki Whānui role as ahi kā and primary mana whenua in Wellington City. This includes the 'use' or 'activities' in SASMs to enable Taranaki Whānui to exercise tino rangatiratanga on their SASM sites.	Seeks amendment to: a) include role of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua or that is most appropriate to address the submission.	Reject	No	38.46	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.	
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-05	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.60	Support	Objective HHSASM-05 is generally supported.	Retain Objective HHSASM-05 (Recognise that only mana whenua...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Historic Heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori / HHSASM-05	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.20	Support in part	Supports the chapter provisions which recognize the risk of natural hazards to significant infrastructure but considers that it is important that the plan provides ways to build resilience for significant cultural infrastructure.	Retain HHSASM-05 (Recognise that only mana whenua can identify impacts on their relationship with their culture, traditions, ancestral lands...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers' rec For reasons see body of report	Changes to PDP?	Further Sub No / Point No	Position	Reasons for Support or Opposition	Decisions Requested
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / General NE	Yvonne Weeber	340.9	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain the 'Natural Environment' chapter as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / General NE	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.20	Oppose in part	As written, the natural environment strategic objectives fail to address the issues identified in the introduction. Furthermore, there is a lack of clear strategic direction to protect and maintain biodiversity values, in accordance with s6, 31, and the RPS.	Amend the NE chapter to address issues identified in the Introduction and clarify strategic direction to protect and maintain biodiversity values in alignment with S6 and S31 of Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement.	Accept in part	No	36.25	Oppose	WIAL considers it appropriate to ensure the provisions of the Proposed Plan give effect to Part 2 of the RMA and the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement. WIAL opposes the submission however, as no specific drafting has been provided in association with this submission point and therefore WIAL cannot determine the appropriateness or otherwise of the amendments in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / General NE	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.21	Support in part	Considers the Introduction does not recognise council's function for integrated management, particularly with respect to the maintenance of indigenous biological diversity, the protection of wetlands and Te Mana o Te Wai.	Amend NE - Introduction to recognise council's function for integrated management, particularly with respect to the maintenance of indigenous biological diversity, the protection of wetlands and Te Mana o Te Wai.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / General NE	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.57	Support in part	Supports the Natural Environment Strategic objectives except as noted below.	Retain Natural Environment Objectives, subject to amendments.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / General NE	Guardians of the Bays	452.8	Support	Supports the Strategic Direction provisions in Natural Environment chapter.	Retain the Natural Environment Chapter as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / New NE	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.58	Amend	Considers it appropriate to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1, the use and development of land needs to be undertaken in an integrated manner recognising the many interconnections between the natural and physical resources. The interconnectedness of the whole environment should be recognised at the strategic level to guide all development in a holistic way.	Add a new Objective to the 'Natural Environment' chapter as follows: <u>Natural and physical resources are managed in an integrated manner recognising the importance of ki uta ki tai and the interconnectedness between ecosystems, natural processes and freshwater.</u>	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-01	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.22	Support in part	Considers the objective fails to protect and maintain biodiversity values, in accordance with s6, s31 of the RMA and the RPS. Natural character, features, landscapes and ecosystems are not just of value because they contribute to the City's identity, they include matters of national importance. We seek amendment of the strategic objective to give effect to council's responsibilities under s6 and functions under s31.	Amend NE-01: The natural character, landscapes and features, <u>indigenous biodiversity</u> and ecosystems, <u>including wetlands, that contribute to the City's identity of the District, including those that</u> and have significance for mana whenua as kaitiaki are identified, recognised, protected, and, where	Accept in part	No	36.26	Oppose	The recommended amendments to the objective conflate section 6 and 7 matters of the RMA.	Disallow

					possible, enhanced.						
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-01	WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.17	Support	Considers there is insufficient focus on the cultural heritage of mana whenua compared with European history and culture: this strategic objective helps to re-balance this.	Retain Objective NE-01 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-01	Director-General of Conservation	385.15	Support	Supports proposed Objective NE-01.	Retain objective NE-01 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-01	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.46	Support in part	Support the acknowledgment of Taranaki Whānui connection with environment and water and of the Taranaki Whānui tikanga and mātauranga in the management of the natural environment.	Retain NE-01 with amendments.	Reject	No	38.47	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
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-01	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.47	Amend	Support the acknowledgment of Taranaki Whānui connection with environment and water and of the Taranaki Whānui tikanga and mātauranga in the management of the natural environment.	Seeks amendment to: a) include role of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua or b) that is most appropriate to address the submission.	Reject	No	38.48	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
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.61	Support	Objective NE-01 is generally supported.	Retain Objective NE-01 (The natural character, landscapes and features,...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-01	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.62	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission.]	Supports NE-01 (Natural character that contributes to city identity and has significance for mana whenua) with amendment.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-01	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.63	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission.]	Amend NE-01 (Natural character that contributes to city identity and has significance for mana whenua) as follows: The natural character, landscapes and features, and ecosystems that contribute to the City's identity and have significance for mana whenua as kaitiaki are identified, recognised, protected maintained.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

					and, where possible, enhanced.						
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-01	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.26	Support	Supports the intent of NE-01.	Retain NE-01 (The natural character, landscapes and features, and ecosystems that contribute ...)as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-01	Paul M Blaschke	435.4	Support	NE-01 is supported.	Retain Strategic Objective NE-01 (he natural character, landscapes and features, and ecosystems that contribute to the City's identity and have significance for mana whenua as kaitiaki are identified, recognised, protected, and, where possible, enhanced) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-02	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.23	Support in part	Considers the objective fails to give effect to the NPS-FW which requires territorial authorities to provide for Te Mana o Te Wai through integrated management ki uta ki tai from mountains to sea. The strategic direction of this plan should recognise the interactions between freshwater, land, water bodies, ecosystems, and sensitive receiving environments. Water quality is not only threatened by future development; poor water quality has resulted from historic development and inadequate investment in infrastructure upgrades. The effects of which also need to be managed. We seek amendment to give effect to the NPS-FW.	Amend NE-02: Future subdivision, <u>land use</u> and development contributes to an improvement in the quality of the City's <u>fresh water</u> , water bodies, <u>ecosystems and sensitive receiving environments</u> and recognises mana whenua and their relationship to water (Te Mana o Te Wai)	Accept in part	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-02	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.59	Support in part	Supports the objective to recognise the relationship of to water as this aligns with Policy FW.3 of Proposed RPS Change 1	Retain Objective NE-02, subject to amendments.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-02	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.60	Amend	Considers that this objective should more widely address the values of tangata whenua and seek that those values are protected and enhanced. These amendments will ensure Policy FW.3 is more wholly given regard to.	Amend Objective NE-02 as follows: Future subdivision and development contributes to an improvement in the quality of the City's water bodies, <u>protects and enhances Māori freshwater values</u> and recognises mana whenua and their relationship to water (Te Mana o Te Wai).	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-02	Waka Kotahi	370.55	Amend	Considers that improving water quality is an extremely high threshold, though Waka Kotahi agrees that gradual improvement is necessary not all works, specifically maintenance activities, can improve water quality. Instead, the submitter seeks that all works shall not worsen water quality.	Amend Strategic Objective NE-02 (Future subdivision and development contributes...) as follows: Future subdivision and development contributes to an improvement in maintains the quality of the City's water bodies, and recognises mana whenua and their relationship to water (Te Mana o Te Wai).	Reject		84.90	Oppose	Greater Wellington consider the approach taken by WCC which seeks to improve water quality is appropriate and aligns with the requirements of the NPS-FM and has regard to Proposed RPS Change 1.	Disallow Seeks that direction for improving the quality of water bodie in NE-02 is retained.
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-02	WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.18	Support	The submitter understand that about 80% of Freshwater bodies within Wellington City have unacceptable pollutant levels: it is important that use and development in natural and rural areas is	Retain Objective NE-02 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				done in a way that sees us improve water quality, as is being recommended for similar activities in the urban parts of the city. Recognising the relationship of mana whenua to water is an important aspect of this, as it sees water quality put first in terms of importance.							
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Director-General of Conservation	385.16	Support	Supports proposed Objective NE-O2.	Retain objective NE-O2 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.48	Support in part	Support the acknowledgment of Taranaki Whānui connection with environment and water and of the Taranaki Whānui tikanga and mātauranga in the management of the natural environment.	Retain NE-O1 with amendments.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.49	Amend	Support the acknowledgment of Taranaki Whānui connection with environment and water and of the Taranaki Whānui tikanga and mātauranga in the management of the natural environment.	Seeks amendment to: a) include role of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua or that is most appropriate to address the submission.	Reject	No	38.50	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
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.62	Support	Objective NE-O2 is generally supported.	Retain Objective NE-O2 (Future subdivision and development contributes...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.27	Support	Supports the intent of NE-O2.	Retain NE-O2 (Future subdivision and development contributes to an improvement in the quality...)as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.21	Support in part	Supports the intention behind NE-O2	Retain NE-O2 (Future subdivision and development contributes to an improvement in the quality of the City's water bodies...) in the Natural Environment chapter as notified, subject to the amendments below.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-O2	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.22	Amend	Considers NE-O2 can be strengthened so that subdivision and earthworks would not only 'contribute' but 'maintain and protect' the values the submitter has for water resources.	Amend NE-O2 (Future subdivision and development contributes to an improvement in the quality of the City's water bodies...) to: Future subdivision and development <u>play a key role improving water quality and they support protecting and enhancing freshwater values</u> contributes to an improvement in the quality of the City's water bodies by recognizing mana whenua values and their relationship to water (Te Mana o Te Wai).	Reject	No	84.110	Support	Greater Wellington also consider that NE-O2 can be strengthened to further protect Māori freshwater values.	Allow Seeks that the NE-O2 be reworded as requested in Greater Wellington's original submission [refer to submission point 351.60].

Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-03	Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.23	Support	Considers that it is important for Council to provide appropriate open space connections across the city where enabling residential development of the Submitters land will contribute to creating these connections.	Retain NE-03 (The City retains an extensive open space network across the City that...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-03	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.24	Support in part	Considers the objective would be clearer with specific use of the words Significant Natural Areas to give effect to s6 and reference to maintenance of indigenous biodiversity to give effect to council's functions under s31. Furthermore, wetlands need to be included to give effect to the RPS	Amend NE-03: The City retains an extensive open space network across the City that: 1. Is easily accessible; 2. Connects the urban and natural environment; 3. Supports <u>Protects significant natural areas, wetlands and ecological, cultural, and landscape values; and</u> 4. <u>Maintains indigenous biodiversity; and</u> Meets the needs of anticipated future growth.	Reject	Yes	36.27	Oppose	The recommended amendments to the objective are inconsistent with and go further than section 6 and 7 of the RMA.	Disallow
								84.98	Support	Greater Wellington agree that replacing "support" with "protect" in clause 3 would give greater effect to the requirements of section 6 of the RMA and that reference to wetlands would align with direction in Proposed RPS Change 1.	Allow
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-03	WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.19	Amend	Considers this should be amended to include the concept of protection.	Add an extra point to NE-03 (The city retains an extensive open space network...) as follows: ... <u>5. Is protected and gazetted under the Reserves Act.</u>	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-03	WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.20	Support	Considers that as the population grows, preserving, and where possible, adding to the open space network across the city is increasingly important. Research increasingly shows the importance of access to natural areas, and 'biophilic' environments as keys to human health and well-being, as well as helping reduce crime, and of course being a critical part of protecting biodiversity. On this matter, Wellington as a city is playing a critical role in providing refuge for formerly at risk native birds, e.g. kaka, and with efforts such as the Halo Project and Predator Free initiatives being undertaken by thousands of Wellingtonians, it is important our city's district plan provides legal and policy support to this.	Retain Objective NE-03 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-03	Wellington Civic Trust	388.9	Support in part	Supports the intention of NE-03, as it relates to the city's green network, however as currently worded it suggests that the network is satisfactory and all that is needed is to "retain" the network.	Retain Amend Natural Environment Objective NE-03 with amendment.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-03	Wellington Civic Trust	388.10	Amend	Considers NE-03 should be amended to clarify that the open space network can and should be expanded, as well as retained. The current wording suggests that the network is satisfactory and all that is needed is to "retain" the network. As currently written, NE-03 does not suggest that the City intends to add to the amount of open space accessible and available to City residents, workers and visitors. It is essential that the need for more open space is signalled at the strategic	Amend Natural Environment Objective NE-03 as follows: The City retains <u>expands its open space network so that</u> an extensive open space network is <u>provided and retained</u> that:"	Accept in part	No	36.28	Oppose	WIAL does not have any issue with the open space network being retained and/or expanded throughout the wider District. WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that it may fetter with the ability for WIAL to completed ongoing seawall upgrade and replacement works within the Open Space area located between Moa Point and Lyall Bay.	Disallow Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.

				level if the Council is to actively pursue the acquisition of more public open space and that it is going to ensure that new development contributes to this provision.							
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-03	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.63	Support	Objective NE-03 is generally supported.	Retain Objective NE-03 (The City retains an extensive open space...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-03	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.28	Support	Supports the intent of NE-03.	Retain NE-03 (The City retains an extensive open space network across the City...)as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-04	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.25	Support	Supports the objective.	Retain NE-04 as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-04	WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.21	Support	Considers there is insufficient focus on mana whenua and their ability to exercise kaitiaki following their own mātauranga: this strategic objective helps to re-balance this.	Retain Objective NE-04 as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-04	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.50	Support in part	Support the acknowledgment of Taranaki Whānui connection with environment and water and of the Taranaki Whānui tikanga and mātauranga in the management of the natural environment.	Retain NE-01 with amendments.	Reject	no	39.51	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
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-04	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.51	Amend	Support the acknowledgment of Taranaki Whānui connection with environment and water and of the Taranaki Whānui tikanga and mātauranga in the management of the natural environment.	Seeks amendment to: a) include role of Taranaki Whānui as ahi kā and primary mana whenua or that is most appropriate to address the submission.	Reject	no	38.52	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
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-04	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.64	Support	Objective NE-04 is generally supported.	Retain Objective NE-04 (Mana whenua are able to exercise their...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Natural Environment / NE-04	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.29	Support	Supports the intent of NE-04.	Retain NE-04 (Mana whenua are able to exercise their customary responsibilities ...)as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers rec For reasons see body of report	Changes to PDP?	Further Sub No / Point No	Position	Reasons for Support or Opposition	Decisions Requested
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / General SCA	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.26	Oppose in part	Considers the introduction and objectives are not consistent with sustainable management as per s5 of the RMA. They fail to integrate environmental outcomes and the protection of biodiversity into the objectives for the City/Wellington district.	Amend the Introduction to be consistent with sustainable management as set out in Section 5 of the Resource Management Act.	Reject	No	36.30	Oppose	Considers it appropriate to ensure the Proposed Plan gives effect to Part 2 of the RMA. WIAL opposes the submission however, as no specific drafting has been provided in association with this submission point and therefore WIAL cannot determine the appropriateness or otherwise of the amendments in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / General SCA	Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.6	Support	The SCA objectives for infrastructure under this chapter are supported when considering the addition of waste facilities as inclusive of infrastructure types for the purposes of the strategic objectives.	Retain the Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure chapter as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / General SCA	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.64	Support	Supports the recognition of Wellington International Airport, as regionally significant infrastructure, within the Introduction of the "Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure" section of the District Plan.	Retain Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure Chapter introduction as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / General SCA	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.30	Amend	Considers that the objectives for dealing with out-of-sequence development proposals are not appropriate. The submitter considers that developers should be limited to paying the net increased cost associated with the development proposal, as assessed against Council's long-term planning for infrastructure spend. The submitter considers that developers should not be expected to provide infrastructure over and above what is required for a particular development proposal. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that out-of-sequence infrastructure costs are dealt with exclusively through the development contributions or financial contributions policy.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.2	Support	The SCA-O1 is supported as it appropriately recognises and provides for infrastructure.	Retain Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure O1 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Meridian Energy Limited	228.16	Support in part	Considers that infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure, is essential to support the safe, efficient and effective functioning of Wellington's community. Achieving resilience in infrastructure networks will require continual development, maintenance, adaptation and upgrading of existing infrastructure to meet future growth and changing needs. If Wellington, along with the Wellington region and New Zealand, are to	Retain Objective SCA-O1 (Infrastructure) with amendment.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				successfully transition away from dependence on fossil fuels and meet the nation's climate change obligations, there will need to be a substantial increase in generation of electricity from renewable sources. Regional and district plans need to anticipate this and enable increased renewable electricity generation.							
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Meridian Energy Limited	228.17	Amend	<p>Considers that infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure, is essential to support the safe, efficient and effective functioning of Wellington's community.</p> <p>Achieving resilience in infrastructure networks will require continual development, maintenance, adaptation and upgrading of existing infrastructure to meet future growth and changing needs. Considers that if Wellington, along with the Wellington region and New Zealand, are to successfully transition away from dependence on fossil fuels and meet the nation's climate change obligations, there will need to be a substantial increase in generation of electricity from renewable sources. Regional and district plans need to anticipate this and enable increased renewable electricity generation.</p>	<p>Amend Objective SCA-O1 (Infrastructure) as follows or similar wording to achieve the same outcome:</p> <p>Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The social, economic, cultural, and environmental benefits of this infrastructure are recognised; 2. The City is able to function safely, efficiently and effectively; 3. The infrastructure network is resilient in the long term; 4. <u>Infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation facilities, contribute to the transition away from dependence on fossil fuels;</u> and 5. Future growth and development is enabled and can be sufficiently serviced. 	Accept in part	Yes	36.31	Oppose	<p>WIAL supports, in principle, the transition away from dependence on fossil fuels and seeks to encourage such changes at the Airport where practicable, including through the gradual electrification of infrastructure at the Airport. WIAL submits however, that there a number of factors outside of its control that will affect the transition towards alternative fuel sources for aircraft using the Airport. WIAL therefore opposes this submission to the extent that the changes need to be qualified, for example, with the term "practicable".</p>	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.24	Support	<p>Considers that it is important for Council to make provision for new urban development where it can be serviced by appropriate and necessary infrastructure. The residential area of the land will be well connected to transport networks, pedestrian facilities, public open space and other social infrastructure.</p>	<p>Retain SCA-O1 (Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that...) as notified.</p>	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Firstgas Limited	304.11	Support	<p>SCA-O1 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes it seeks related to the establishment, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure.</p>	<p>Retain Objective SCA-O1 as notified.</p>	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.41	Support	<p>Supports the provision of a strategic objective specific to Infrastructure, given its importance to the city, region and nation. Considers the objective gives effect to RPS Objective 10 and policies 7 and 8.</p>	<p>Retain SCA-O1 as notified.</p>	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.27	Oppose	Considers it is not clear whether this objective should be regarding RSI or not as it appears to reflect policy 7 of the RPS which is for RSI, not infrastructure generally. Infrastructure can have significant adverse effects on the environment from construction to operation, maintenance and upgrades. s6 matters still apply and this objective needs to ensure infrastructure doesn't impact the protection of biodiversity.	Amend SCA-O1: Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that: 1. The social, economic, cultural, and environmental benefits of this infrastructure are recognised; 2. The City is able to function safely, efficiently and effectively; 3. The infrastructure network is resilient in the long term; and 4. Future growth and development is enabled and can be sufficiently serviced; <u>and</u> <u>Indigenous biodiversity is retained, protected and enhanced.</u>	Reject	no	27.17	Oppose	WELL do not support this submission point as it seeks to, at a high-level, restrict the provision of infrastructure to Wellington City's businesses and communities. Infrastructure is a fundamental component to enable social, cultural and economic wellbeing. The amendments sought by the submitter are unbalanced and in effect will diminish the positive effects of efficient infrastructure provision. The submission point seeking that the words "Indigenous biodiversity is retained, protected and enhanced" is noble, however, is considered to be out of place in the purpose and intent of Proposed SCA-O1.	Disallow
								36.32	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submits as it conflicts with WIAL's primary submission that seeks for these objectives to be retained as notified. WIAL also submits that the changes proposed seek to "cherry pick" section 6 and 7 matters. Section 6 and 7 matters are addressed by other provisions within the Strategic Direction of the Proposed Plan. Changes recommended to the Strategic Directions (Transpower 315.40) will clarify that these provisions which give effect to section 6 and 7 of the RMA will apply, ensuring that infrastructure providers have to look to the broader strategic direction provisions, not just those contained in the Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure section.	Disallow
								72.10	Oppose	Rejects deletion of clause 1. Considers benefits of infrastructure must be recognised in strategic direction. KiwiRail also considers that the retention, protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity is provided for in NE-O1. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
								101.14	Oppose	Considers that all infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure, delivers benefits for the Wellington City communities. All relevant benefits should be recognised. There is no mandate in the RMA or any of the higher order documents for retaining, protecting and enhancing all indigenous biodiversity. There is mandate in section (6) of the RMA and the NZCPS for protecting significant indigenous biodiversity and significant habitats of indigenous fauna.	Disallow

								104.3	Oppose	It is important that the social, economic, cultural, and environmental benefits of infrastructure are recognised in Strategic City Assets Objective SCA-O1.	Disallow Reject submitter's relief and retain Strategic City Assets Objective SCA-O1 as notified.
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Waka Kotahi	370.56	Amend	Considers that additional wording is needed to give effect to carbon reduction.	Amend Strategic Objective SCA-O1 (Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained...) as follows: Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that: 1. The social, economic, cultural, and environmental benefits of this infrastructure are recognised; 2. The City is able to function safely, efficiently and effectively; 3. The infrastructure network is resilient in the long term; and 4. Future growth and development is enabled and can be sufficiently serviced. <u>Infrastructure shall be delivered in a way which provides for carbon reduction targets.</u>	Accept in part	Yes	36.33	Oppose	Considers that while WIAL has been actively encouraging the transition to lower carbon alternatives where practicable (such as the electrification of GPUs and APUs and investigating the use of renewable energy sources) at the Airport, there a number of factors outside of its control that will affect the transition towards alternative fuel sources for aircraft using the Airport. WIAL therefore opposes this submission to the extent that it requires infrastructure to be delivered in a way that "provides" for carbon reduction targets. Alternative drafting or qualification of this statement (for example, using the term "where practicable") would better reflect this scenario.	Disallow Seeks that part of the submission be disallowed.
								72.11	Support	Agrees that infrastructure shall be delivered in a way that provides for carbon reduction targets. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
								84.91	Support	Greater Wellington strongly support this submission point and consider this amendment would contribute positively to reducing carbon emissions	Allow
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.22	Amend	Considers that this objective should be clarified in two ways: Firstly, the infrastructure should provide value rather than value being recognised as a side benefit. Secondly, the protection or enhancement of the environment should be a prerequisite	Amend SCA-O1 (infrastructure is established, operated...) as follows: Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that: 1. <u>It provides</u> The social,	Reject	No	36.34	Oppose	WIAL submits that the amendments conflate and oversimplify the directions set out in sections 6 and 7 of the RMA. Furthermore, the environment includes "natural and physical resources", therefore the amendments do not provide any further assistance in terms of clarifying which resources are to be "protected" or "enhanced". WIAL submits that other provisions within the Strategic Directions address the issues raised by the submitter.	Disallow

					economic, cultural, and environmental benefits of this infrastructure are recognised; ... <u>5. The environment is protected or enhanced</u>			101.15	Oppose	Considers that the intention of the objective is, consistent with the approach adopted generally nationwide, that in making decisions about new and upgraded infrastructure the listed benefits must be recognised This approach gives effect to the relevant higher order National Policy statements and is to be preferred over the requested amendment. There is no mandate in the RMA or the higher order policy instruments for protecting or enhancing the environment in an absolute sense as suggested.	Disallow
								104.4	Oppose	NZDF supports the policy directive of Strategic City Assets Objective SCA-O1 Clause (1) that the social, economic, cultural, and environmental benefits of infrastructure are recognised; as opposed to infrastructure providing for the aforementioned benefits. NZDF opposes the amendment sought to include new Clause (5) to protect or enhance the environment.	Disallow Reject submitter's relief and retain Strategic City Assets Objective SCA-O1 as notified.
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.65	Support	Objective SCA-O1 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SCA-O1 (Infrastructure is established, operated,...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Ministry of Education	400.13	Support in part	Supports Objective SCA-O1 in part.	Retain SCA-O1 (infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that...) with amendment.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Ministry of Education	400.14	Amend	Seeks that SCA-O1 includes reference to 'additional infrastructure'. The submitter notes that under the NPS-UD and the Definitions Chapter of the Proposed District Plan, educational facilities are included in the definition of 'additional infrastructure'. The submitter considers that the amendment will ensure educational facilities are enabled to service future growth and support the community's social and educational needs. The submitter seeks to highlight that Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure is provided in development and local authorities must be satisfied that additional infrastructure to service the development capacity is likely to be available [see original submission for full reason].	Amend SCA-O1 (Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that...) as follows: <u>Infrastructure and additional infrastructure</u> is established... ...	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	CentrePort Limited	402.33	Support in part	Considers that the Strategic direction in relation to infrastructure resilience would be enhanced by also referring to the ability to provide for infrastructure recovery after short term natural hazard events.	Retain SCA-O1 (Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that...) with amendment.	Reject	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	CentrePort Limited	402.34	Amend	Considers that the Strategic direction in relation to infrastructure resilience would be enhanced by also referring to the ability to provide for infrastructure recovery after short term natural hazard events.	Amend SCA-O1 (Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that...) as follows: ... 3. The infrastructure network is resilient in the long term <u>and can effectively recover from short term Natural Hazard events</u> ; and ...	Reject	Yes	36.35	Support	Considers that as a lifeline utility operator with Civil Defence responsibilities, WIAL supports the amendments proposed to subparagraph 3.	Allow
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.65	Support	Considers that it is appropriate for the strategic objectives to recognise the significance and importance of regionally significant infrastructure. Supports SCA O1. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 and 4.20 to 4.24 for full reason]	Retain SCA-O1 (Establishment, operations, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.22	Support	Supports the strategic direction to establish, operate, maintain and upgrade infrastructure so that clauses 1 to 4 can be achieved. This will ensure the importance of rail and ferry infrastructure is recognised and the network is a resilient network that can function efficiently and effectively in the long term.	Retain SCA-O1 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.31	Amend	Considers that the objectives (including SCA-O1) for dealing with out-of-sequence development proposals are not appropriate. The submitter considers that developers should be limited to paying the net increased cost associated with the development proposal, as assessed against Council's long-term planning for infrastructure spend. The submitter considers that developers should not be expected to provide infrastructure over and above what is required for a particular development proposal. [See original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O1	New Zealand Defence Force	423.6	Support	Considers that it is important to provide for the establishment, operation, maintenance, and upgrading of infrastructure in Wellington City, and recognise that infrastructure provides a range of benefits through supporting the safe and efficient functioning of the City, along with future growth and development.	Retain SCA-O1 (Infrastructure is established, operated, maintained, and upgraded in Wellington City so that...)as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-02	Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.3	Support	The SCA-02 is supported as it appropriately recognises and provides for infrastructure.	Retain Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure O2 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-02	Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.25	Support	Considers that it is important for Council to make provision for new urban development where it can be serviced by appropriate and necessary infrastructure. The residential area of the land will be well connected to transport networks, pedestrian facilities, public open space and other social infrastructure.	Retain SCA-02 (New urban development occurs in locations that are supported by sufficient development infrastructure capacity) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-02	Firstgas Limited	304.12	Support	SCA-02 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes it seeks related to infrastructure.	Retain Objective SCA-02 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-02	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.28	Oppose	Considers the objective does not adequately safeguard matters of national importance in s6 of the RMA as well as give effect to the NPS-FW regarding Te Mana o Te Wai.	Amend SCA-02: New urban development occurs in locations that are supported by sufficient development infrastructure capacity, <u>protect indigenous biodiversity, and can ensure protection of Te Mana o Te Wai</u> or where this is not the case the development: 1. Can meet the development infrastructure costs associated with the development <u>which also provides for the protection of indigenous biodiversity and Te Mana o Te Wai</u> , and Supports a significant increase in development capacity for the City.	Reject	No	27.18	Oppose	WELL do not support these submission points because they seek to conflate high-level ecological and biodiversity concepts into an area of the PDP specifically focused on the importance of strategic infrastructure provision and development growth. The matters sought to be inserted in to the objectives by the Submitter would be best placed in to the PDP provisions pertaining to ecological and biodiversity matters – where their effects and sought protection would be better balanced and accounted for as appropriate. WELL seek the purpose and integrity of SCA-02 and O3 is maintained and for Council to reject these submission points.	Disallow
								101.16	Oppose	Considers that there is no mandate in the RMA or higher order policy instruments for protection of all indigenous biodiversity. The NPS-FM requirement is that freshwater (as opposed to land resources) is managed to give effect to Te Mana o te Wai (NPS-FM 2020 Policy 1).	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-02	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.13	Oppose in part	Supports the recognition in (1) that development that is not supported by sufficient infrastructure capacity can proceed if it meets its own infrastructure requirements. However, Opposes the qualifier in (2) that requires such development to support a “significant increase in development capacity”. This additional qualifier is not necessary if development meets its own infrastructure requirements. This objective is inconsistent with THW-O2.	Opposes SCA-02 (Strategic Objectives) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-02	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.14	Amend	Supports the recognition in (1) that development that is not supported by sufficient infrastructure capacity can proceed if it meets its own infrastructure requirements. However, Opposes the qualifier in (2) that requires such development to support a “significant increase in development capacity”. This additional qualifier is not necessary if development meets its own infrastructure requirements. This objective is inconsistent with THW-02.	Seeks amendment to SCA-02 (Strategic Objectives) to provide for development where it is supported by sufficient development infrastructure capacity or where the development can provide for its own infrastructure requirements (e.g. through on-site works).	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-02	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.17	Support in part	Supports Objective SCA-02 in part as it ensures development and the provision of infrastructure is coordinated and aligned from an infrastructure delivery perspective. However, the use of the limited term ‘Development Infrastructure’ omits the provision of other key infrastructure such as the Wellington Electricity Lines Limited electricity distribution network.	Retain Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure Objective SCA-02 with amendment.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-02	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.18	Amend	Considers that Objective SCA-02 should be amended to not neglect coverage of critical infrastructure that is not defined as ‘Development Infrastructure’. As it stands the Objective supports a “significant increase in development capacity for the City”, whereby such development capacity is exclusive to Additional Infrastructure, such as the electricity distribution network. For such higher-level PDP objectives, it is considered that the provision of all key infrastructure is identified at the strategic level – not solely directed towards Council owned or controlled infrastructure as is currently drafted in the objective.	Amend Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure Objective SCA-02 as follows: iii New urban development occurs in locations that are supported by sufficient development infrastructure capacity, or where this is not the case the development: 1. Can meet the development infrastructure costs associated with the development, and Supports a significant increase in development capacity for the City.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-02	Waka Kotahi	370.57	Amend	Notes a broken link for the definition of 'development infrastructure'	Amend SCA-02 (New urban development occurs in locations...) to fix the broken link to 'development infrastructure' definition.	Reject		NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-02	Waka Kotahi	370.58	Support	Supports this strategic objective as written.	Retain Strategic Objective SCA-02 (New urban development occurs in locations) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-02	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.66	Support	Objective SCA-02 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SCA-02 (New urban development occurs in locations...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-02	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.32	Amend	<p>Considers that the objectives (including SCA-02) for dealing with out-of-sequence development proposals are not appropriate. The submitter considers that developers should be limited to paying the net increased cost associated with the development proposal, as assessed against Council's long-term planning for infrastructure spend.</p> <p>The submitter considers that developers should not be expected to provide infrastructure over and above what is required for a particular development proposal.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend SCA-02 (New urban development occurs in locations that are supported...) as follows:</p> <p>New urban development occurs in locations that are supported by sufficient development infrastructure capacity, or where this is not the case the development:</p> <p>1. Can meet the <u>net increase in development infrastructure costs associated with the development (as assessed against the costs expected to be incurred by Council were it not for the development)</u> and supports a significant increase in development capacity for the City.</p>	Reject		NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-03	Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.4	Oppose in part	<p>The intent of SCA-03 is supported as it recognises the role of Additional Infrastructure (other than three-waters and transport infrastructure) to support growth. This is consistent with the NPS-UD. However, there is a cross referencing error. The objective cross refers to Objective UFD-06 which is the previous draft plan reference for this provision. It should be amended to UFD-07.</p>	<p>Amend Objective SCA-03 such that the cross reference is made to Objective UFD-07.</p>	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-03	Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.26	Support	<p>Considers that it is important for Council to make provision for new urban development where it can be serviced by appropriate and necessary infrastructure. The residential area of the land will be well connected to transport networks, pedestrian facilities, public open space and other social infrastructure.</p>	<p>Retain SCA-03 (Additional infrastructure is incorporated into new urban developments of a nature and scale that supports Strategic Objective UFD-06 or provides significant benefits at a regional or national scale) as notified.</p>	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-03	Firstgas Limited	304.13	Support	<p>SCA-03 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes it seeks related to the incorporation of additional infrastructure.</p>	<p>Retain Objective SCA-03 as notified.</p>	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-03	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.29	Support in part	Considers the objective does not sufficiently provide for S6 matters in the RMA.	Amend SCA-03: Additional infrastructure is incorporated into new urban developments of a nature and scale that supports Strategic Objective UFD-06 or provides significant benefits at a regional or national scale <u>while protecting indigenous biodiversity.</u>	Reject	No	27.19	Oppose	WELL do not support these submission points because they seek to conflate high-level ecological and biodiversity concepts into an area of the PDP specifically focused on the importance of strategic infrastructure provision and development growth. The matters sought to be inserted in to the objectives by the Submitter would be best placed in to the PDP provisions pertaining to ecological and biodiversity matters – where their effects and sought protection would be better balanced and accounted for as appropriate. WELL seek the purpose and integrity of SCA-02 and 03 is maintained and for Council to reject these submission points.	Disallow
								101.17	Oppose	Considers that the RMA, NZCPS and RPS require protection of significant indigenous biodiversity (not all indigenous biodiversity).	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-03	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.15	Oppose in part	Opposes the requirement for new urban development to incorporate ‘additional infrastructure’ (e.g. public open space, community facilities) that is not required by the development or relate to effects of the development. Considers that new development will contribute to such infrastructure through development contributions and this provision may result in ‘double dipping’.	Delete SCA-03 (Strategic Objectives) in its entirety as notified.	Reject		NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-03	Waka Kotahi	370.59	Support	Supports this strategic objective as written.	Retain Strategic Objective SCA-03 (Additional infrastructure is incorporated into new urban...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-03	Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.24	Support in part	Supports strategic objective SCA-03 subject to hospitals being expressly included in the definition of ‘additional infrastructure’ as sought above.	Retain SCA-03 as notified, if the amendment sought to the definition of ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE’ is made.	Reject		NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-03	Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.25	Amend	Considers alternative amendment to strategic objective SCA-03, to ensure that hospitals are recognised as social infrastructure that must be incorporated in urban developments to provide significant regional and potentially national benefits.	Seeks for strategic objective SCA-03 to alternatively be amended to the following: “Additional infrastructure (including hospitals) is incorporated into new urban developments of a nature and scale that supports Strategic Objective UFD-06 or provides significant benefits at a regional or national scale.”	Reject		NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-03	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.67	Support	Objective SCA-03 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SCA-03 (Additional infrastructure is incorporated...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-03	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.33	Amend	<p>Considers that the objectives (including SCA-03) for dealing with out-of-sequence development proposals are not appropriate. The submitter considers that developers should be limited to paying the net increased cost associated with the development proposal, as assessed against Council's long-term planning for infrastructure spend.</p> <p>The submitter considers that developers should not be expected to provide infrastructure over and above what is required for a particular development proposal.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason].</p>	Delete SCA-03 (Additional infrastructure is incorporated into new urban developments...) in its entirety.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-04	Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.5	Support	The SCA-04 is supported as it appropriately recognises and provides for infrastructure.	Retain Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure O4 as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-04	Meridian Energy Limited	228.18	Support	Considers objective SCA-04 (Regionally significant infrastructure) appropriately gives effect to the NPS-Renewable Electricity Generation 2011. The policies and rules of the Plan that give effect to Objective SCA-04 need to be refined to genuinely provide for renewable electricity generation activities, as an essential form of regionally significant infrastructure, if New Zealand's aim of transitioning away from fossil fuels is to be achieved.	Retain Objective SCA-04 (Regionally significant infrastructure) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-04	Firstgas Limited	304.14	Support	SCA-04 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes it seeks related to the provision of Regionally Significant Infrastructure and the benefits recognised and provided for.	Retain Objective SCA-04 as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-04	Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.42	Support	Supports SCA-04 on the basis that it recognises the development of new infrastructure, noting SCA-01 relates to existing infrastructure.	Retain Objective SCA-04 as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Yvonne Weeber	340.10	Amend	Considers that SCA-O4 should be reworded to apply to all new infrastructure and to recognise the limits of existing infrastructure's location. It is considered that many present day regional significant infrastructure would not be placed in their present location using present day planning practices. The objective SCA-O4 suggests that existing regionally significant infrastructure e.g. Wellington Airport is in an 'appropriate location'. However, it is unclear whether building Wellington Airport in a location surrounded by residential neighbourhoods and coastal environments would be deemed an 'appropriate location' currently. SCA-O4 should be reworded to apply to all new infrastructure, but recognise existing infrastructure is not always in the most 'appropriate location', does not provide a full suite of benefits and needs to improve its planning and management to create social, cultural and environmental benefits.	Amend Objective SCA-O4 so that it clarifies that it applies to all new infrastructure and recognises the limits of existing infrastructure's location.	Reject	No	36.36	Oppose	WIAL submits that the "limits" sought by this submitter are defined by Objective SCA-O5.	Disallow
								101.18	Oppose	Meridian does not agree that all existing infrastructure can be considered to be inappropriately located. In the absence of any specific wording, it is not reasonable to properly consider the implications of, or allow, the request.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.30	Support in part	Considers the objective does not align with policy 7 of the RPS that directs the recognition of the benefits of RSI and the consideration of social, economic, cultural and environmental benefits. It does not direct that RSI would be provided for over environmental protections which are to be provided for under s6 of the Act or over Councils functions to maintain indigenous biological diversity. PS objective is for recognition and protection of RSI. Seek amendment to ensure alignment with RPS	Amend SCA-O4: Regionally significant infrastructure is provided for in appropriate locations and the social, cultural economic, and environmental benefits of this infrastructure are recognised and provided for.	Reject	No	27.20	Oppose	WELL do not support the sought amendment to SCA-O4 which is the deletion of the words "... and provided for" in relation to the social, cultural, economic and environmental benefits provided for by regionally significant infrastructure. The sought deletion will diminish the purpose and intent of the objective, and as such, the submission point is not supported by WELL.	Disallow
								29.14	Oppose	Policy 1 of the NPSET requires that the "decision makers must recognise and provide for the national, regional, and local benefits of sustainable, secure, and efficient electricity transmission". SCA-O4 as notified is therefore supported.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Waka Kotahi	370.60	Support	Supports this strategic objective as written.	Retain Strategic Objective SCA-O4 (Regionally significant infrastructure is provided for in appropriate...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.68	Support	Objective SCA-O4 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SCA-O4 (Regionally significant infrastructure is provided...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O4	CentrePort Limited	402.35	Support	Support the intent of this Objective.	Retain SCA-O4 (Regionally significant infrastructure is provided for in appropriate locations and the social, cultural economic, and environmental benefits of this infrastructure are recognised and provided for) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-04	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.66	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission.]	Retain SCA-04 (Regionally significant infrastructure) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-04	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.23	Support	Supports that the objective recognises the benefits of and provides for regionally significant infrastructure in appropriate locations.	Retain SCA-04 as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-04	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.34	Amend	Considers that the objectives (including SCA-04) for dealing with out-of-sequence development proposals are not appropriate. The submitter considers that developers should be limited to paying the net increased cost associated with the development proposal, as assessed against Council's long-term planning for infrastructure spend [See original submission for full reason]. The submitter considers that developers should not be expected to provide infrastructure over and above what is required for a particular development proposal [See original submission for full reason].	Not specified.	Reject		NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-04	Guardians of the Bays	452.9	Amend	Many present day regional significant infrastructure would not be placed in their present location using present day planning practices. This objective suggests that existing regionally significant infrastructure e.g. Wellington Airport is in an 'appropriate location'. However, it is very doubtful if the Wellington Airport location surrounded by residential neighbourhoods and coastal environments would be built now and deemed an 'appropriate location'. Ideally the submitter would like this objective reworded to apply to all new infrastructure but recognising existing infrastructure is not always in the most 'appropriate location' and does not provide a full suite of benefits but needs to improve its planning and management to create social, cultural and environmental benefits.	Amend the wording of the objective to recognise the submitters concerns in respect of existing infrastructure location	Reject	No	36.37	Oppose	WIAL submits that the "limits" sought by this submitter are defined by Objective SCA-05.	Disallow
								101.20	Oppose	Meridian does not agree that all existing infrastructure can be considered to be inappropriately located. In the absence of any specific wording, it is not reasonable to properly consider the implications of, or allow, the request.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.6	Support	The SCA-05 is supported as it appropriately recognises and provides for infrastructure.	Retain Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure 05 as notified.	Accept in part		NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Meridian Energy Limited	228.19	Support in part	Considers objective SCA-05 (adverse effects of infrastructure) appropriately gives effect to the NPS-Renewable Electricity Generation 2011. However, the expression adopted by the National Planning Standards and typically used is 'functional needs' and 'operational needs' (rather than 'technical' needs) and 'functional need' is a defined term in the Plan.	Retain Objective SCA-05 (The adverse effects of infrastructure are managed having regard to the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits, and the technical and operational needs of infrastructure.) with amendment.			NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Meridian Energy Limited	228.20	Amend	Considers objective SCA-05 (adverse effects of infrastructure) appropriately gives effect to the NPS-Renewable Electricity Generation 2011. However, the expression adopted by the National Planning Standards and typically used is 'functional needs' and 'operational needs' (rather than 'technical' needs) and 'functional need' is a defined term in the Plan.	Amend Objective SCA-05 (The adverse effects of infrastructure are managed having regard to the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits, and the technical and operational needs of infrastructure.) to align with the National Planning Standards as follows: The adverse effects of infrastructure are managed having regard to the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits, and the technical functional and operational needs of infrastructure.	Accept in part	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.27	Support	Considers that it is important for Council to make provision for new urban development where it can be serviced by appropriate and necessary infrastructure. The residential area of the land will be well connected to transport networks, pedestrian facilities, public open space and other social infrastructure.	Retain SCA-05 (The adverse effects of infrastructure are managed having regard to the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits, and the technical and operational needs of infrastructure) as notified.	Accept in part		NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Firstgas Limited	304.15	Support	SCA-05 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes it seeks related to the provision of Regionally Significant Infrastructure and the benefits recognised and provided for.	Retain Objective SCA-05 as notified.	Accept in part		NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.43	Support	Supports the provision of a strategic objectives specific to infrastructure, given its importance to the city, region and nation. Considers the objective gives effect to RPS Objective 10 and policies 7 and 8.	Retain Objective SCA-05 as notified.	Accept in part		NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.31	Oppose in part	Considers it is not clear whether this objective should be regarding RSI or not as it appears to reflect policy 7 of the RPS which is for RSI, not infrastructure generally. The RPS acknowledges that regionally significant infrastructure can also have adverse effects on the surrounding environment and community.	Amend SCA-05: The adverse effects of infrastructure are managed avoided while having regard to the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits, and the technical and operational needs of infrastructure.	Reject		27.21	Oppose	WELL do not support the amendments sought by the submission point as they seek to constrain the provision of development and additional infrastructure which is required to serve Wellington communities and businesses. The submission point seeks to include the word 'avoided' in regard to infrastructure provision – which is considered inappropriate in the context of the strategic growth and development objective. The submission point seeks to unduly influence the provision of effective and efficient infrastructure with unavoidable environmental effects.	Disallow

								29.15	Oppose	Notwithstanding whether the strategic objective should apply to RSI or infrastructure generally, a blanket avoid directive with no consideration of the scale or nature of the adverse effect is not supported at a strategic objective level.	Disallow
								36.38	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate for the all adverse effects, regardless of the nature or scale of those effects, to be avoided, nor has such a management threshold been applied to other activities in the District. Furthermore, the submitters concerns appear to relate to the application of this objective to infrastructure more generally (i.e. not just to RSI).	Disallow
								72.12	Oppose	<p>Considers that infrastructure cannot always avoid all adverse effects on the environment, as recognised by the RPS and the PDP. KiwiRail seeks the retention of 'manage' effects of infrastructure and recognition of the benefits of infrastructure in this objective.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Disallow
								101.21	Oppose	Considers that it is not consistent with the RMA framework, or with the relevant higher order policy instruments, to require all adverse effects of infrastructure to be avoided. Economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits are relevant in terms of the RMA framework and higher order policy instruments.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Waka Kotahi	370.61	Support	Supports this strategic objective as written.	Retain Strategic Objective SCA-05 (The adverse effects of infrastructure are managed...) as notified.	Accept in part		NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.69	Support	Objective SCA-05 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SCA-05 (The adverse effects of infrastructure...) as notified.	Accept in part		NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B - Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure

Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	CentrePort Limited	402.36	Support in part	Considers that the use of the word managed is open to interpretation and is of limited assistance to decision makers.	Retain SCA-05 (The adverse effects of infrastructure are managed having regard to the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits, and the technical and operational needs of infrastructure) with amendment.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	CentrePort Limited	402.37	Amend	Considers that the use of the word managed is open to interpretation and is of limited assistance to decision makers.	Amend SCA-05 (The adverse effects of infrastructure are managed having regard to the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits, and the technical and operational needs of infrastructure) as follows: The adverse effects of infrastructure are managed <u>avoided, remedied or mitigated</u> having regard to the economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits, and the technical and operational needs of infrastructure.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.67	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission.]	Retain SCA-05 (Adverse effects of infrastructure) as notified.	Accept in part		NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.24	Support	Supports the direction to manage the adverse effects of infrastructure having particular regard to the technical and operational needs of infrastructure.	Retain SCA-05 as notified.	Accept in part		NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-05	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.35	Amend	Considers that the objectives (including SCA-05) for dealing with out-of-sequence development proposals are not appropriate. The submitter considers that developers should be limited to paying the net increased cost associated with the development proposal, as assessed against Council's long-term planning for infrastructure spend. The submitter considers that developers should not be expected to provide infrastructure over and above what is required for a particular development proposal. [See original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	Reject		NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-06	Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)	99.7	Support	The SCA-06 is supported as it appropriately recognises and provides for infrastructure.	Retain Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure O6 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-06	Meridian Energy Limited	228.21	Support	Considers SCA-06 (efficient and safe infrastructure) appropriately gives effect to the NPS-Renewable Electricity Generation 2011 and is necessary to protect all infrastructure, including regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain Objective SCA-06 (efficient and safe infrastructure) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-06	Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.28	Support	Considers that it is important for Council to make provision for new urban development where it can be serviced by appropriate and necessary infrastructure. The residential area of the land will be well connected to transport networks, pedestrian facilities, public open space and other social infrastructure.	Retain SCA-06 (Infrastructure operates efficiently and safely and is protected from incompatible development and activities that may create reverse sensitivity effects) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-06	Firstgas Limited	304.16	Support	SCA-06 is generally supported in terms of the outcomes sought for the efficient and safe operation of the infrastructure, and protection from incompatible development and activities that may create reverse sensitivity effects on the infrastructure.	Retain Objective SCA-06 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-06	Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.44	Support in part	Supports the provision of a strategic objective specific to Infrastructure, given its importance to the city, region and nation. However, an amendment is sought to the SO to reflect that in addition to reverse sensitivity, infrastructure needs to be protected to ensure it is not compromised. Considers the sought amendment would make it clear that effects on infrastructure are not confined to reverse sensitivity.	Supports Strategic Direction SCA-06, with amendment.	Accept in part		NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-06	Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.45	Amend	Supports the provision of a strategic objective specific to Infrastructure, given its importance to the city, region and nation. However, an amendment is sought to the SO to reflect that in addition to reverse sensitivity, infrastructure needs to be protected to ensure it is not compromised. Considers the sought amendment would make it clear that effects on infrastructure are not confined to reverse sensitivity.	Amend Strategic Direction SCA-06 as follows: Infrastructure operates efficiently and safely and is protected from incompatible development and activities, <u>including those</u> that may create reverse sensitivity effects <u>or compromise the Infrastructure</u> .	Accept in part		36.39	Support	The proposed amendments provide further clarification around the interpretation and application of the objective.	Allow
								101.22	Support	Meridian agrees that reverse sensitivity is not the only potential adverse effect that can compromise the operation of infrastructure. Examples of other adverse effects include the establishment of activities or allowing traffic activities that have the potential to interfere with safe access to existing lawfully established infrastructure sites, or the establishment of activities or public access that introduces a risk of direct damage to lawfully established infrastructure (including regionally significant infrastructure).	Allow

								104.6	Support	Support amendment to the objective for the protection of infrastructure from incompatible development and activities, including those that may create reverse sensitivity effects or compromise infrastructure.	Allow
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-06	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.32	Oppose	This policy appears to give effect to policy 8 of the RPS but again, that is for RSI not infrastructure more generally. We do not support blanket protection of infrastructure from incompatible development. It is for infrastructure to not impact on the environment, not the other way around.	Delete SCA-06.	Reject		27.22	Oppose	WELL do not support the submission point to delete SCA-06 given the highlevel and strategic intent of the objective. SCA-06 is an objective, rather than a policy as indicated by the submitter, and given the strategic importance of infrastructure provision – Objective SCA-06 should be retained, with the submission point rejected.	Disallow
								29.16	Oppose	Notwithstanding whether the strategic objective should apply to RSI or infrastructure generally, Strategic Objective SCA-06 is supported in that it recognises the effect of other activities on infrastructure. The provision of such an objective does not negate the need for infrastructure to manage its adverse effects on the environment. On that basis, the relief sought by the submitter is opposed.	Disallow
								36.40	Oppose	Considers that reverse sensitivity is a significant concern for a number of infrastructure operators. The concept of reverse sensitivity relates to other activities establishing within proximity to existing and lawfully established (infrastructure) activities, and then complaining about the effects of this activity.	Disallow
								72.13	Oppose	Rejects the deletion of this objective. Considers it is important that adverse effects on infrastructure are recognised in the Plan and there are appropriate provisions in place to protect infrastructure. Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow
								104.5	Oppose	It is appropriate for the policy direction of the Proposed Plan to provide for the protection of infrastructure from incompatible development and activities that may create reverse sensitivity effects.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-06	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.19	Support	Supports Objective SCA-06 as it clearly recognises the protection of existing electricity distribution infrastructure in the wake of housing intensification across the City. It is noted that the PDP is striving to facilitate responsible compact	Retain SCA-06 of the Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure chapter as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				urban development and the consequential infill through the recently imposed Housing Supply Legislation. Consequently it is agreed that the protection of existing RSI and associated facilities are important that such infill does not result in enhance reverse sensitivity effects.							
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-06	Waka Kotahi	370.62	Support in part	Supports this strategic objective as written.	Retain Strategic Objective SCA-06 (Infrastructure operates efficiently and safely...), subject to amendment.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-06	Waka Kotahi	370.63	Amend	Considers it appropriate to add a reference to adverse health effects	Amend Strategic Objective SCA-06 (Infrastructure operates efficiently and safely...) as follows: Infrastructure operates efficiently and safely and is protected from incompatible development and activities that may create reverse sensitivity effects or adverse health effects.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-06	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.70	Support	Objective SCA-06 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SCA-06 (Infrastructure operates efficiently...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-06	CentrePort Limited	402.38	Support	Support the intent of this Objective.	Retain SCA-06 (Infrastructure operates efficiently and safely and is protected from incompatible development and activities that may create reverse sensitivity effects) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-06	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.68	Support	Considers that it is of significant importance to the ongoing operation and protection of regionally significant infrastructure, such as airports, that adverse reverse sensitivity effects are avoided. Supports the inclusion of SCA-06. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 and 4.20 to 4.24 for full reason]	Retain SCA-06 (Infrastructure operates efficiently and safely) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-06	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.25	Support	Supports strategic direction to protect the operation of infrastructure from incompatible development and activities that may create reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain SCA-06 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-06	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.36	Amend	Considers that the objectives (including SCA-06) for dealing with out-of-sequence development proposals are not appropriate. The submitter considers that developers should be limited to paying the net increased cost associated with the development proposal, as assessed against Council's long-term planning for infrastructure spend.	Not specified.	Reject		NA	NA	NA	NA

				The submitter considers that developers should not be expected to provide infrastructure over and above what is required for a particular development proposal. [See original submission for full reason]							
Strategic Direction / Strategic City Assets and Infrastructure / SCA-O6	New Zealand Defence Force	423.7	Support	Considers that it is important to protect infrastructure from incompatible development and activities that may create reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain SCA-O6 (Infrastructure operates efficiently and safely and is protected from incompatible development and activities that may create reverse sensitivity effects) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers rec For reasons see body of report	Changes to PDP?	Further Submission No / Point No	Position	Reasons for Support or Opposition	Decisions Requested
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.7	Support	Supports the PDP's intentions of 'growing up' instead of out and creating a compact city. Supports compact housing.	Not specified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Roland Sapsford	305.27	Amend	Considers that the District Plan should focus its action on climate change by applying targeted and focal intensification to create local nodes or "urban villages" rather than broad brush intensification or intensification focussed in already dense areas. Considers that Emission reduction through intensification occurs largely through changes in the ways and distances people travel. Intensifying already dense areas has little effect on emissions. Rather it is modest changes in focal density in lower density areas that has the most impact.	Seeks that the District Plan be amended to focus on reducing existing emissions through focal intensification and the creation of nodes or "urban villages" in areas of relatively low density, rather than simply a broad brush approach to intensification.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Yvonne Weeber	340.11	Support	The net zero emission city' by 2050 goal set for Wellington City is supported. It is considered one of the most important aspects of the plan. Setting a goal of net zero emissions, has to be supported with clear objectives, policies, rules and standards throughout the plan if it is going to be achieved.	Retain the mention of 'net zero emission city by 2050' in the Introduction of the 'Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change' chapter.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Yvonne Weeber	340.12	Support in part	The fourth paragraph of the Introduction is generally supported, but it is considered that climate change adaptation should be included within the introduction on Sustainability, Resilience and climate change.	Retain the fourth paragraph of the Introduction of the 'Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change' chapter with amendment.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Yvonne Weeber	340.13	Amend	Considers that climate change adaptation should be included within the introduction of the Sustainability, Resilience and climate change chapter.	Amend the fourth paragraph of the Introduction of the 'Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change' chapter as follows: ... There remains a level of uncertainty about the full extent of the impacts of climate change and sea level rise. This means the planning framework needs to retain a level of flexibility to enable the City to adapt in response to changing circumstances <u>including includes climate change adaptation.</u> ...	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.33	Support in part	Supports the intent of the Introduction but are unclear how it integrates across the Plan.	Clarify SRCC - Introduction to integrate across the Plan.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.61	Support in part	Supports WCC taking a science-based approach for City-wide carbon emissions target setting.	Retain Introduction, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.62	Amend	Considers there is an inconsistency in the references to carbon reduction objectives across strategic objectives, including 'net zero' 'zero-emission city; and 'zero carbon'.	Seeks to amend the Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change chapter to ensure references to carbon reduction objectives are consistent and clear.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.22	Support	The Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change chapter is supported, as it signals a direction to reduce carbon emissions and effects on climate change through the use of renewable energy technologies. This direction is reflected in the Renewable Energy Generation chapter which seeks to enable large and small-scale renewable energy investigation and generation activities.	Retain the Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change chapter as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.23	Amend	Considers that the Introduction of the Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change should be amended to have consistency of language regarding the city's response to climate change. It is laudable to see a commitment to align with the goal of net zero emissions by 2050. However, this section uses inconsistent language and does not fully express the urgency needed to address climate change, nor the critical role that cities can play through their Plans.	Amend the Introduction to the Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change chapter to give effect to the clarification of "net zero emission " or " zero carbon".	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Guardians of the Bays	452.10	Support	Supports the intentions of the chapter. The submitter considers is one of the most important aspects of this plan. Setting a goal of net zero emissions, has to be supported with clear objectives, policies, rules and standards throughout the plan if it is going to be achieved.	Retain the sentence in the introduction of the chapter' Wellington City has a goal of being a net zero emission city by 2050' as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Guardians of the Bays	452.11	Support in part	Supports paragraph four of the Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change chapter.	Retain paragraph four in the Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change) chapter subject to amendments below.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / General SRCC	Guardians of the Bays	452.12	Amend	Considers climate change adaptation should be included within the introduction on Sustainability, Resilience and climate change	Amend paragraph 4 of the introduction as follows: There remains a level of uncertainty about the full extent of the impacts of climate change and sea level rise. This means the planning framework needs to retain a level of flexibility to enable the City to adapt in response to changing circumstances <u>including includes climate change adaptation.</u>	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / New SRCC	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.23	Amend	Support the chapter provisions which encourage the use of sustainable transport options, reduction in private vehicle use and aim to improve economic and social resilience.	Seeks that the Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change objectives are amended to ensure that resilience is built in all spheres, being environmental,	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

					cultural, social and economic as they are interconnected and specifically better support cultural resilience.						
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O1	Meridian Energy Limited	228.22	Support	Considers that an increase in the generation of electricity from renewable sources (including wind and solar) is necessary to meet growing demand locally and nationally and to enable New Zealand to meet its objectives for renewable electricity generation and minimise the use of fossil fuels.	Retain Objective SRCC-O1 (built environment) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O1	Yvonne Weeber	340.14	Support in part	The Objective SRCC-O1 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective SRCC-O1 with amendment.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O1	Yvonne Weeber	340.15	Amend	Considers that Objective SRCC-O1 needs an additional bullet point to reflect the need to consider climate change adaptation.	Amend Objective SRCC-O1 as follows: ... <u>5. Climate change adaptation</u>	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O1	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.34	Support in part	Considers that the objectives may allow renewable energy sources (e.g. windfarms) being built in the CMA and the protection of biodiversity and adverse effects being over looked at the expense of renewable energy generation. Suggest tightening relevant objectives to ensure s6 matters are provided for.	Amend SRCC-O1 to ensure matters set out in Section 6 of the Resource Management Act are provided for.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O1	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.63	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of a strategic objective that supports a reduction in carbon emissions.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.	Reject	No	36.41	Oppose	WIAL has filed as submission with respect to PC1 of the Proposed RPS and the target to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2050. Considers that it would be premature to impose such requirements on the Proposed Plan, when those provisions have yet to go through the hearings and decision making process.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O1	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.64	Amend	Considers the objective is different to the carbon reduction target made by WCC in October 2021 to reduce city emissions by 57% by 2030 compared to 2020 levels, and then net zero by 2050. Proposed RPS Change 1 has a similar target of 50% by 2030 compared to 2019 levels, and then net zero by 2050. Greater Wellington supports WCC for setting this target and seek for this target to be reflected in the PDP. This will ensure consistency and appropriate levels of ambition with regard to WCC's contribution to the region's emission reduction targets	Seeks that the carbon reduction objective should match that made by WCC in October 2021 to reduce city emissions by 57% by 2030 compared to 2020 levels, and to net zero by 2050.	Reject	No	36.42	Oppose	WIAL has filed as submission with respect to PC1 of the Proposed RPS and the target to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2050. Considers that it would be premature to impose such requirements on the Proposed Plan, when those provisions have yet to go through the hearings and decision making process	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O1	Waka Kotahi	370.64	Amend	As written, O1.3 does not reference the move needed away from private cars to other transport modes, which has additional benefits not captured by O1.1. Freeing up carparking spaces for greener uses, having less embodied energy (in the vehicle fleet) & having greater transport	Amend Strategic Objective SRCC-O1 (The City's built environment supports:...) as follows: The City's built environment supports:	Accept in part	Yes	84.92	Support	Greater Wellington support this submission point which aligns with Proposed RPS Change 1 (Policies CC.1 and CC.3).	Allow

				resilience in the event of an earthquake are examples of this.	1. A net reduction in the City's carbon emissions by 2050; 2. More energy efficient buildings; 3. An increase in the use of renewable energy sources; and 4. <u>Multi-modal transport options including but not limited to walking, cycling, and public transport, and</u> Healthy functioning of native ecosystems and natural processes.						
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O1	WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.24	Amend	Considers that Objective SRCC-O1 is not worded with a sufficient degree of ambition and urgency. Nor will it achieve the stated goal of being a zero carbon emission city by 2050. It leaves the door open for inadequate incremental progress which could lock us in to a path of failure.	Amend Objective SRCC-O1 as follows: The City's built environment supports:	Accept in part	Yes	36.43	Oppose	WIAL has filed as submission with respect to PC1 of the Proposed RPS and the target to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2050. Considers that it would be premature to impose such requirements on the Proposed Plan, when those provisions have yet to go through the hearings and decision making process.	Disallow
					1. A net reduction in the City's carbon emissions <u>to net zero</u> by 2050; 2. More <u>A requirement for all buildings to be</u> energy efficient buildings; 3. An increase in the use of renewable energy sources <u>up to 100% by 2030</u> ; and Healthy functioning of <u>the full range of</u> native ecosystems and natural processes.			101.23			
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O1	Wellington Civic Trust	388.11	Support in part	SRCC-O1 is generally supported, but there is concerns that sea level rise risks are not well characterised.	Retain Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change Objective SRCC-O1, with amendment.	Accept in part	No	91.49	Oppose	The further submitter is opposed the generic support for all new additions to SCHED1. The further submitter does not believe the original submitter has made any detailed assessment of each scheduled item to inform their view, and as such, believe their submission point should be discounted. [See original further submission for full reason].	Disallow Seeks that the Council does not add new listings of private homes without owner's consent.
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O1	Wellington Civic Trust	388.12	Amend	Considers that SRCC-O1 should be amended to 'tighten up' in respect to climate change and natural hazard risks.	Seeks to clarify SRCC-O1 in respect to climate change and natural hazards.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC -O1	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.71	Support	Objective SRCC-O1 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SRCC-O1 (The City's built environment supports:...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O1	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.69	Support	Supports the overall intent of SRCC-O1, with particular focus on the increase in renewable energy sources. [See paragraph 4.25 to 4.29 in original submission for full reason]	Retain SRCC-O1.3 (Increase of renewable energy sources) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC -O1	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.37	Support	Supports the direction of SRCC-O1.	Retain SRCC-O1 (The City's built environment supports...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC -O1	Newtown Residents' Association	440.11	Support in part	SRCC-O1 is supported, but the way the objective is reflected in the PDP is lacking.	Retain Strategic Objective SRCC-O1 as notified with amendments.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O1	Newtown Residents' Association	440.12	Amend	<p>Considers that the practical application of SRCC-O1 is limited in the PDP and will not be met due to loss of sunlight in residential areas. A central objective of the NPS-UD 2020, and by extension the RMA schedule 3A and the WCC Proposed District Plan, is that "Development supports the creation of a liveable, well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety now and into the future."</p> <p>A extended definition of 'well functioning urban environment' contains these points: f- supports reduction in greenhouse gas emissions; and g - are resilient to the likely current and future effects of climate change</p> <p>When it comes to the built environment, the application of liveable, well-functioning urban environments seems to lead to sporadic development of high rise buildings in narrow, packed, low-rise streets. The major environmental effects come with the loss of sunlight. Sunlight is important for a carbon-zero lifestyle – it fuels solar panels, helps gardens grow, dries the washing, and heats people's homes. If tall buildings are able to overshadow low-rise homes the latter risk becoming cold and damp, leading to illness, and in some cases the homes will become unfit for purpose. Sunlight is vital for everyday life. With new developments the standards require a certain amount of sunlight access but there is no guarantee of this being protected for existing neighbouring properties. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that the PDP better ensures that SRCC-O1 Objectives are implemented.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC- O1	Guardians of the Bays	452.13	Support in part	Supports SRCC-O1.	Retain paragraph SRCC-O1 subject to amendments below.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O1	Guardians of the Bays	452.14	Amend	Considers SRCC-O1 needs the addition of a further bullet point to reflect the need to consider climate change adaptation	Amend SRCC-O1 as follows: The City's built environment supports: 1. A net reduction in the City's carbon emissions by 2050; 2. More energy efficient buildings; 3. An increase in the use of renewable energy sources; and 4. Healthy functioning of native ecosystems and natural processes. <u>Climate Change Adaptation</u>	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O1	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.24	Support in part	Support the chapter provisions which encourage the used of sustainable transport options, reduction in private vehicle use and aim to improve economic and social resilience.	Retain SRCC-O1 (The City's built environment supports...) as notified, subject to amendments.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O2	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.20	Support	Supports the objective in that it requires the risks from natural hazards, which include fire as per the definition within the Proposed District Plan, to be appropriately managed, mitigated, and where necessary, avoided.	Retain SRCC-O2 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O2	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.35	Support in part	Considers that the objectives may allow renewable energy sources (e.g. windfarms) being built in the CMA and the protection of biodiversity and adverse effects being over looked at the expense of renewable energy generation. Suggest tightening relevant objectives to ensure s6 matters are provided for.	Amend SRCC-O2 to ensure matters set out in Section 6 of the Resource Management Act are provided for.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC -O2	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.65	Support	Supports this strategic objectives.	Retain Strategic Objective SRCC-O2 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O2	Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.13	Support	Supports risks from natural hazards being appropriately identified, and natural and coastal hazards being identified and risks apportioned appropriately, and in a way which identifies and recognises the existing investment, development and role of the city centre	Retain Objective SRCC-O2 as notified	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC -O2	Wellington Civic Trust	388.13	Support in part	SRCC-O2 is generally supported, but there is concerns that sea level rise risks are not well characterised.	Retain Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change Objective SRCC-O2, with amendment.	Accept in part	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O2	Wellington Civic Trust	388.14	Amend	Considers that SRCC-O2 should be amended to 'tighten up' in respect to climate change and natural hazard risks. SRCC-O2 may not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement in its requirement to avoid increasing the risks from climate change in areas of new development. The bar of avoiding when risks are "intolerable" in item 3 of this objective suggests a very high threshold to prevent further subdivision and development, including intensification, which exposes more people to the effects of sea level rise in the future.	Seeks to clarify SRCC-O2 in respect to climate change and natural hazards.	Accept in part	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O2	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.72	Support	Objective SRCC-O2 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SRCC-O2 (Risks from natural hazards are...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O2	CentrePort Limited	402.39	Support in part	Considers that ensuring that all risks are low in clause 2 may be very difficult to achieve for all infrastructure providers in all circumstances who work within specific constraints. It would be more accurate to state that residual risks after adaptation and mitigation measures have been applied are acceptable.	Retain SRCC-O2 (Risks from Natural Hazards are...) with amendment.	Accept in part	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O2	CentrePort Limited	402.40	Amend	Considers that ensuring that all risks are low in clause 2 may be very difficult to achieve for all infrastructure providers in all circumstances who work within specific constraints. It would be more accurate to state that residual risks after adaptation and mitigation measures have been applied are acceptable.	Amend SRCC-O2 (Risks from Natural Hazards are...) as follows: ... 2. Planned for through adaptation and mitigation measures to ensure residual risks are low acceptable; and ...	Accept in part	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O2	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.70	Support in part	Intolerable risk to natural hazards is a relative and subjective concept. Given the subjectiveness of the concept of intolerable risk and the strong directive set out in sub-paragraph 3, Objective SRCC-O2 needs to recognise that in the case of regionally significant infrastructure, functional or operational requirements of that infrastructure may necessitate locating in an area that is subject to natural hazard risk.	Retain SRCC-O2 (Risks from natural hazards) with amendments.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O2	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.71	Amend	Intolerable risk to natural hazards is a relative and subjective concept. Given the subjectiveness of the concept of intolerable risk and the strong directive set out in sub-paragraph 3, Objective SRCC-O2 needs to recognise that in the case of regionally significant infrastructure, functional or operational requirements of that infrastructure may necessitate locating in an area that is subject to natural hazard risk.	Amend SRCC-O2 (Risks from natural hazards) as follows: Risks from natural hazards are: 1. Identified and understood; 2. Planned for through adaptation and mitigation measures to ensure the risks are low; 3. <u>Except as provided for in 4, Avoided where the risks are intolerable; and Managed to the extent practicable where an activity has an operational or functional need to locate within an identified natural hazard area.</u>	Reject	No	72.14	Support	Supports recognition of the functional and operational requirements of infrastructure to be located in areas subject to natural hazard risk. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow

Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O2	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.72	Amend	Intolerable risk to natural hazards is a relative and subjective concept. Given the subjectiveness of the concept of intolerable risk and the strong directive set out in sub-paragraph 3, Objective SRCC-O2 needs to recognise that in the case of regionally significant infrastructure, functional or operational requirements of that infrastructure may necessitate locating in an area that is subject to natural hazard risk.	Delete Objective SRCC-O2.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O2	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.38	Support	Supports the direction of SRCC-O2.	Retain SRCC-O2 (Risks from natural hazards are..) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O2	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.25	Support in part	Support the chapter provisions which encourage the used of sustainable transport options, reduction in private vehicle use and aim to improve economic and social resilience.	Retain SRCC-O2 (Risks from natural hazards are...) as notified, subject to amendments.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O3	Yvonne Weeber	340.16	Support in part	The Objective SRCC-O3 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective SRCC-O3 with amendment.	Accept in part	No	36.44	Oppose	Considers that infrastructure falls within the scope of “activities” identified through the use of the phase “subdivision, use and development”. Separately identifying activities that fall within this term (and excluding others) leads to potential interpretation issues.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O3	Yvonne Weeber	340.17	Amend	Considers the Objective SRCC-O3 should be amended to add infrastructure into the list of the starting sentence.	Amend Objective SRCC-O3 as follows: Subdivision, <u>infrastructure</u> , development and use: ...	Reject in part	No	36.45	Oppose	Considers that infrastructure falls within the scope of “activities” identified through the use of the phase “subdivision, use and development”. Separately identifying activities that fall within this term (and excluding others) leads to potential interpretation issues.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O3	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.36	Support in part	Considers that the objectives may allow renewable energy sources (e.g. windfarms) being built in the CMA and the protection of biodiversity and adverse effects being over looked at the expense of renewable energy generation. Suggest tightening relevant objectives to ensure s6 matters are provided for.	Amend SRCC-O3 to ensure matters set out in Section 6 of the Resource Management Act are provided for.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O3	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.66	Support	Supports objective as it recognises that working with the natural environment, adopting adaptive pathway planning and employing a risk lens to urban development, are effective principles for addressing the uncertainties inherent in climate change.	Retain Strategic Objective SRCC-O3 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O3	Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.14	Support	Supports strategic objectives which support subdivision, development and use that manage the risks associated with climate change and sea level rise and support adaptation, and natural and coastal hazards being identified and risks apportioned appropriately, and in a way which identifies and recognises the existing investment, development and role of the city centre	Retain Objective SRCC-O3 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Appendix B - Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change

Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O3	Wellington Civic Trust	388.15	Support in part	SRCC-O3 is generally supported, but there is concerns that sea level rise risks are not well characterised.	Retain Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change Objective SRCC-O3, with amendment.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O3	Wellington Civic Trust	388.16	Amend	Considers that SRCC-O3 should be amended to 'tighten up' in respect to climate change and natural hazard risks.	Seeks to clarify SRCC-O3 in respect to climate change and natural hazards.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O3	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.73	Support	Objective SRCC-O3 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SRCC-O3 (Subdivision, development and use: ...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O3	CentrePort Limited	402.41	Support	Support the intent of this Objective.	Retain SRCC-O3 (Subdivision, development and use) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O3	Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.26	Amend	Considers that: "Early research shows that sympathetically upgrading and reusing existing buildings, rather than demolishing and building new, could dramatically improve a building's energy efficiency and would make substantial energy savings because the CO ₂ emissions already embodied within existing buildings would not be lost through demolition," Historic England Heritage Counts report, 2020.	Amend SRCC-O3 as follows: Subdivision, development and use: 1. Effectively manage the risks associated with climate change and sea level rise; 2. Support the City's ability to adapt over time to the impacts of climate change and sea level rise; and 3. Support natural functioning ecosystems and processes to help build resilience into the natural and built environments <u>and:</u> <u>Recognise the environmental benefits of retaining buildings, especially heritage buildings.</u>	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O3	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.39	Support	Supports the direction of SRCC-O3.	Retain SRCC-O3 (Subdivision, development and use...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC O3	Guardians of the Bays	452.15	Support in part	Supports SRCC-O3.	Retain paragraph SRCC-O3 subject to amendments below.	Accept in part	No	36.46	Oppose	Considers that infrastructure falls within the scope of "activities" identified through the use of the phase "subdivision, use and development". Separately identifying activities that fall within this term (and excluding others) leads to potential interpretation issues.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O3	Guardians of the Bays	452.16	Amend	Considers the objective needs to be amended to add 'infrastructure' in the title.	Amend SRCC-O3 as follows: Subdivision, <u>infrastructure</u> , development and use...	Reject	No	36.47	Oppose	Considers that infrastructure falls within the scope of "activities" identified through the use of the phase "subdivision, use and development". Separately identifying activities that fall within this term (and excluding others) leads to potential interpretation issues.	Disallow

Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC 03	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.26	Support in part	Support the chapter provisions which encourage the used of sustainable transport options, reduction in private vehicle use and aim to improve economic and social resilience.	Retain SRCC-03 (Subdivision, development and use...) as notified, subject to amendments.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC 04	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society	345.37	Support in part	Considers that the objectives may allow renewable energy sources (e.g. windfarms) being built in the CMA and the protection of biodiversity and adverse effects being over looked at the expense of renewable energy generation. Suggest tightening relevant objectives to ensure s6 matters are provided for.	Amend SRCC-04 to ensure matters set out in Section 6 of the Resource Management Act are provided for.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC 04	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.16	Oppose in part	Opposes the requirement for development to "integrate[e] natural processes that provide opportunities for carbon storage, natural hazard risk reduction and support climate change adaptation" as it is unclear what this objective requires.	Delete SRCC-04 (Strategic Objectives) in its entirety as notified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC 04	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.67	Support	Supports this strategic objectives.	Retain Strategic Objective SRCC-04 as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC 04	Woolworths New Zealand	359.14	Amend	Considers that the wording in SRCC-04 should be amended to ensure that there is recognition of the potential for non-natural processes to achieve the same environmental outcomes in an efficient way (e.g., storm filters and other proprietary devices still achieve low impact design and quality / quantity benefits for stormwater runoff and can be more easily accommodated on urban sites where swales, raingardens and other space-intensive activities cannot) such that the matters at the Three Waters chapter are consistent with this Part 2 Objective.	Amend Objective SRCC-04 as follows: Land use, subdivision and development design integrates natural processes that provide opportunities for carbon storage, natural hazard risk reduction and support climate change adaptation, <u>promoting natural processes where possible.</u>	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-04	Waka Kotahi	370.65	Support in part	Supports this strategic objective as written.	Retain Strategic Objective SRCC-04 (Land use, subdivision and development design...), subject to amendments.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC 04	Waka Kotahi	370.66	Amend	Considers it appropriate to add a reference to the need to reduce carbon as an option prior to storing the produced carbon	Amend Strategic Objective SRCC-04 (Land use, subdivision and development design...) as follows: Land use, subdivision and development design integrates natural processes that provide opportunities for <u>carbon reduction</u> , carbon storage, natural hazard risk reduction and support climate change adaptation.	Accept	Yes	84.93	Support	Greater Wellington support this submission point and consider carbon reduction provides further opportunities to meet reduced carbon targets.	Allow
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC 04	Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.15	Support	Supports strategic objectives which support subdivision, development and use that manage the risks associated with climate change and sea level rise and support adaptation, and natural and coastal hazards being identified and risks apportioned appropriately, and in a way which	Retain Objective SRCC-04 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				identifies and recognises the existing investment, development and role of the city centre							
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O4	Wellington Civic Trust	388.17	Support in part	SRCC-O4 is generally supported, but there is concerns that sea level rise risks are not well characterised.	Retain Sustainability, Resilience and Climate Change Objective SRCC-O4, with amendment.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O4	Wellington Civic Trust	388.18	Amend	Considers that SRCC-O4 should be amended to 'tighten up' in respect to climate change and natural hazard risks.	Seeks that SRCC-O4 in respect to climate change and natural hazards.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC-O4	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.74	Support	Objective SRCC-O4 is generally supported.	Retain Objective SRCC-O4 (Land use, subdivision and development...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC -O4	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.40	Support	Supports the direction of SRCC-O4.	Retain SRCC-O4 (Land use, subdivision and development design...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Sustainability Resilience and Climate Change / SRCC -O4	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.27	Support in part	Support the chapter provisions which encourage the used of sustainable transport options, reduction in private vehicle use and aim to improve economic and social resilience.	Retain SRCC-O4 (Land use, subdivision and development design integrates natural processes...) as notified, subject to amendments.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

67Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Officers rec For reasons see body of report	Changes to PDP?	Further Sub No / Point No	Position	Reasons for Support or Opposition	Decisions Requested
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.8	Support	Supports the strategic direction in the PDP to increase housing choice and affordability.	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.9	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the effects of urban development, including building emissions or land disruption, on native birds or trees in the surrounding areas are monitored.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.14	Support	Supports the recognition of an undersupply of housing in the City, and the approach to increase housing choice and affordability by enabling development across the housing spectrum – from assisted housing solutions through to private home ownership.	Retain introduction for the Urban Form and Development chapter as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Restaurant Brands Limited	349.7	Support	Support	Retain UFD – Te Āhua Tāone me te Whanaketanga - Urban Form and Development as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.68	Support in part	Supports the objectives that aim to ensure development is well connected to the transport network.	Retain the Urban Form and Development Objectives, subject to amendments.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.69	Amend	Considers that these strategic objectives have regard to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1. This includes (but is not limited to) urban areas that are climate resilient, contribute to the protection of the natural environment and transition to a low-emission region, are compact and well connected, support housing affordability and choice, and enable Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms. Consent decisions should need to consider how particular subdivision, use or development is contributing to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments.	Amend wording of these strategic objectives as required to have regard to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments, as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Reject	No	103.1	Support	It is appropriate that territorial authorities align their plans with directions in the relevant Regional Policy Statement, including its description of well-functioning urban environments to ensure consistency in the application of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) across the Tier 1 Councils in the Greater Wellington urban area.	Allow
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.7	Amend	Considers that a staged approach to development capacity is more appropriate. The National Policy Statement on Urban Development requires the Council to enable sufficient development capacity in the short, medium term and long term. This means a staged approach is appropriate given the changing demographics and needs of our city over the next 30 years. Given building consent figures, further development capacity does not appear to be necessary until the medium term (2024 - 2031). [Refer to original submission for full reason and figures]	Seeks that a staged approach to housing development be adopted.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.26	Support	Supports the direction of the Proposed Plan to support well functioning urban environments. This is important because the Proposed Plan is required to give effect to the NPS-UD, and the NPS-UD identifies the appropriate level of intensification that should be enabled in tier 1 urban environments such as Wellington – including recognising that urban environments change over time.	Retain Urban Form and Development strategic objectives as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.75	Oppose	Opposes the definition of 'Assisted Housing' and its reference in the UFD chapter.	Opposes the term 'Assisted housing' in the Urban Form and Development chapter.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.76	Amend	Considers that the references to 'assisted housing' should be removed from the UFD Chapter	Amend the Urban Form and Development chapter to remove all references to 'assisted housing'.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.77	Amend	Considers that the references to 'assisted housing' should be removed from the UFD- Introduction.	Amend the Urban Form and Development chapter to remove all references to 'assisted housing' including and not limited to the introduction.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.3	Support	Supports the principles outlined in the Urban Form and Development chapter and the extension of Wellington City into the greenfield areas identified using those principles.	Retain UFD (Urban form and development) chapter as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Metlifecare Limited	413.4	Amend	<p>In the Urban Form and Development section, the primary issue identified is population growth resulting in a higher demand for housing in circumstances where capacity modelling shows that this demand is unlikely to be met.</p> <p>The introduction explains this issue but does not explicitly recognise the crucial role that retirement and aged care facilities have in providing for the health and wellbeing of the New Zealand community and the provision of housing for elderly residents.</p> <p>This fails to recognise that the local community benefits from the provision of retirement villages. For example, they release pressure on social and health services and contribute to employment in New Zealand, both in the construction sector and day- to-day operations. They also allow residents to live in familiar suburbs where they often have family and friends in close proximity. Further, Retirement Villages have a crucial role in the general housing market because the supply of retirement village housing releases existing housing stock into the market and reduces pressure on existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Metlifecare seeks amendments to be made to this section to recognise the growing role that</p>	<p>Amend the introduction as follows: “Enabling sufficient land supply for housing and business activity is crucial for the ability of residents to meet their social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing. The National Policy Statement on Urban Development requires the Council to provide sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand for housing and business land over the short (3 years), medium (3-10 years), and long term (10-30 years). This District Plan sets the policy foundation to enable growth to be accommodated beyond the life of the Plan. <u>Particular consideration also needs to be given to the growing demand for housing for the elderly, including retirement villages. The demand for retirement village housing is increasing as more New Zealanders are choosing to live in retirement villages, enjoying the range of facilities, housing options, activities, and social and health benefits on offer which are able</u></p>	Accept in part	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA

				retirement villages will have in providing healthy, safe, affordable homes that meet the needs of older people in the community and in keeping up with housing demand. This should then filter down into other objectives and policies in the Proposed Plan	<p><u>to suit the needs of older people in the community.”</u></p> <p>...</p> <p>The District Plan approach is to increase housing choice and affordability by enabling development across the housing spectrum – from assisted housing solutions through to private home ownership. <u>In doing so, the District Plan must recognise and provide for the functional and operational requirements of these different types of housing solutions, including retirement villages.”</u></p>						
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / General UFD	Newtown Residents' Association	440.13	Not specified	Considers that UFD Objectives are incompatible with requirements from the NPS-UD 2020 and the RMA Shedule 3B and will enable negative unintended consequences.	Not specified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / New UFD	Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.70	Amend	Considers that further policy direction is required to achieve these objectives. Specifically, to have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1 (policies CC.1, CC.3 and CC.9), a new policy should be included in the PDP that prioritises development, whether it be greenfield or brownfield development, in areas where there are effective public transport links.	Add a new Objective to the 'Urban Form and Development' chapter that directs the prioritisation of development in locations where there are effective public transport links.	Reject	No	36.48	Oppose	Considers that while WIAL considers it is appropriate to concentrate development along transportation routes, such decision making also needs to take into consideration the presence and proximity of regionally significant infrastructure and potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Disallow
								126.55	Not specified	The RVA does not oppose this submission point in principle, however the RVA's primary position is that retirement villages do not rely on public transport links the same as other residential developments, and therefore the new rule sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend
								128.55	Not specified	Ryman does not oppose this submission point in principle, however Ryman's primary position is that retirement villages do not rely on public transport links the same as other residential developments, and therefore the new rule sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / New UFD	Metlifecare Limited	413.5	Amend	Consider that as currently drafted this objective does not recognise the importance of housing being able to provide both social and health benefits in the community.	Seeks that a new strategic objective is incorporated as follows: <u>UDF - 09 The housing and care needs of the ageing population are recognised and provided for across the City to meet demand.</u>	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-01	Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.10	Support	Support growing new urban centres in highly connected suburbs. Considers that they have the capability to service an intensified community and provide an urban centre for business and recreation. The focus should be on the growth of urban areas along transport routes and in suburbs with easily	Seeks that the chosen areas for growing new urban centres should focus on highly connected suburbs with easily accessible transport lines. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				accessible transport lines.							
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-01	Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.29	Support	Considers that it is important that Council encourages development that will support a more compact City.	Retain UFD-01 (Wellington's compact urban form is maintained with the majority of urban development located within the City Centre, in and around Centres, and along major public transport corridors.) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-01	Woolworths New Zealand	359.15	Support	UFD-01 is supported.	Retain Objective UFD-01 (Wellington's compact urban form is maintained...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-01	Waka Kotahi	370.67	Support	Supports this strategic objective as written.	Retain Strategic Objective UFD-01 (Wellington's compact urban form is maintained...) as notified.	Accept	No	72.15	Support	Supports objective. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-01	Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.16	Support	Supports maintaining Wellington's 'compact urban form'. The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments. Argosy supports the strategic direction set by the NPS-UD. The feedback that Argosy provides on the provisions below seeks to ensure that the rules and standards in the District Plan enable this outcome	Retain Objective UFD-01 as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-01	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.78	Support	Objective UFD-01 is generally supported.	Retain Objective UFD-01 (Wellington's compact urban form...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-01	Investore Property Limited	405.27	Support	Supports provision of a compact urban form and urban intensification provided under UFD-01. The NPS-UD requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of	Retain UFD-01 (Strategic Objectives) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments [Refer to original submission for full reason].							
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-01	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.41	Support	Supports the direction of UFD-01.	Retain UFD-01 (Wellington's compact urban form is maintained...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-01	Stride Investment Management Limited	470.11	Support	Supports UFD-01 (Wellington's compact urban form is maintained...)	Retain as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-01	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.28	Support in part	Considers there is insufficient provision for papakainga in the proposed District Plan.	Retain UFD-01 (Wellington's compact urban form is maintained...) as notified, subject to consistent use of 'active partnership' requested in subsequent submission points	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-02	Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.11	Support	Supports the goal of UFD-02 (Urban Form and Development - Objectives). Considers that compact urban forms are needed to reduce the city's carbon emissions and the need for residents to travel in private vehicles.	Retain UFD-02 (Urban development in identified greenfield areas) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-02	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.17	Oppose in part	Opposes in part the 'centres and transport corridors' approach to urban intensification. Considers that this approach does not recognise that retirement villages are required in all areas.	Opposes UFD-02 (Strategic Direction) and seeks amendment to recognise that the centres and transport corridor approach is not appropriate for some forms of development.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-02	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.18	Amend	Opposes in part the 'centres and transport corridors' approach to urban intensification. Considers that this approach does not recognise that retirement villages are required in all areas.	Seeks amendment to UFD-02 (Strategic Direction) to recognise that the centres and transport corridor approach is not appropriate for some forms of development.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-02	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.19	Support in part	Considers that UFD-02 refers to 'identified greenfield areas', but no such identification of the greenfield areas referred to is provided elsewhere in the District Plan.	Retain UFD-02 (Strategic Direction) and seeks clarification as to what/where the 'identified greenfield areas' are located; or seeks amendment UFD-02 (Strategic Direction) as follows: Urban development in identified greenfield areas:	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-02	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.20	Amend	Considers that UFD-02 refers to 'identified greenfield areas', but no such identification of the greenfield areas referred to is provided elsewhere in the District Plan.	Seeks amendment to UFD-02 (Strategic Direction) either clarify as to what/where the 'identified greenfield areas' are located; or amend UFD-02 (Strategic Direction) as follows: Urban development in identified greenfield areas:	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-02	Woolworths New Zealand	359.16	Support	UFD-02 is supported.	Retain Objective UFD-02 (Urban development in identified greenfield areas:...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-02	Waka Kotahi	370.68	Amend	The submitter would like to see direction in this section for new greenfield developments to include some areas dedicated to 'central neighbourhood' functions, to meet the day-today needs of future residents without the need for private vehicle travel.	Amend Strategic Objective UFD-02 (Urban development in identified greenfield areas:...) as follows: Urban development in identified greenfield areas: 1. Is environmentally and ecologically sensitive; 2. Makes efficient use of land; 3. Is well-connected to the public transport network, and 4. Reinforces the City's compact urban form.; and 5. <u>A mix and distribution of land uses within greenfield area to provide opportunities for business activities and employment, community facilities and open space close to where people live.</u>	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-02	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.79	Support	Objective UFD-02 is generally supported.	Retain Objective UFD-02 (Urban development in identified greenfield areas:...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-02	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.73	Not specified	Incompatible urban development, particularly greenfield development, has the potential to constrain and/or curtail the operation, development and use of regionally significant infrastructure. Urban development should not be enabled or encouraged where it has the potential to adversely affect the operations of the Airport. [See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 of original submission for full reason]	Amend UFD-02 (Urban development in greenfield areas) as follows: Urban development in identified greenfield areas: 1. Is environmentally and ecologically sensitive; 2. Makes efficient use of land; 3. Is well-connected to the public transport network. and 4. Reinforces the City's compact urban form.; and <u>Is compatible with surrounding regionally significant infrastructure.</u>	Reject	No	44.30	Oppose	Considers that regionally significant infrastructure does not need to be included UFD-02 wording UFD-03. [Inferred reference to submission 406.73]	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-02	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.42	Support	Supports the direction of UFD-02.	Retain UFD-02 (Urban development in identified greenfield areas...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-02	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.29	Support in part	Considers there is insufficient provision for papakainga in the proposed District Plan.	Retain UFD-02 (Urban development in identified greenfield areas...) as notified, subject to consistent use of 'active partnership' requested in subsequent submission points	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.12	Support	Supports growing new urban centres in highly connected suburbs, such as Khandallah. The train line to Khandallah in particular is the fastest train route on offer in the Wellington network and operates every 15 minutes, making this ideal for intensification.	Supports residential intensification in Khandallah due to its transport connectivity.	Accept in part	No	82.24	Oppose	Considers submissions are inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements; and no justification for enabling more intensive development in the MDRZ or around rail stations.	Disallow

Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Phillippa O'Connor	289.3	Support	Supports the Objective UFD-03 as notified.	Retain UFD-03 (Medium to high density and assisted housing developments are located in areas that are...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.30	Support	Considers that it is important that Council encourages development that will support a more compact City.	Retain UFD-03 (Medium to high density and assisted housing developments are located in areas that are...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.46	Amend	Considers that within the General Residential Zone qualifying matter areas may limit the amount of permitted medium density development possible on an allotment. While the policy directive within UFD-03 is supported, the submitter supports reference to qualifying matter areas as they directly influence the capacity for intensification.	Amend Objective UFD-03 as follows: UFD-03 Medium to high density and assisted housing developments are located in areas that are: 1. Connected to the transport network and served by multi-modal transport options; or 2. Within or near a Centre Zone or other area with many employment opportunities; and 3. Served by public open space and other social infrastructure;_ <u>Noting that medium to high density housing developments may not be appropriate in qualifying matter areas.</u>	Accept in part	No	89.24	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the amendment which is considered unnecessary and inconsistent with their original submission.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.47	Support in part	Considers that within the General Residential Zone qualifying matter areas may limit the amount of permitted medium density development possible on an allotment. While the policy directive within UFD-03 is supported, the submitter supports reference to qualifying matter areas as they directly influence the capacity for intensification.	Amend UFD-03 as follows: UFD-03 Medium to high density and assisted housing developments are located in areas that are: 1. Connected to the transport network and served by multi-modal transport options; or 2. Within or near a Centre Zone or other area with many employment opportunities; and 3. Served by public open space and other social infrastructure;_ <u>Noting that medium to high density housing developments may not be appropriate in qualifying matter areas.</u>	Accept in part	No	36.49	Support	WIAL considers that it is appropriate for the objective to qualify that intensification may not be appropriate in all locations. The subsequent objectives, policies and overlays identified in the Proposed Plan (such as the Air Noise Boundary) will define where such activities are and are not appropriate.	Allow
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.21	Oppose in part	Opposes in part the 'centres and transport corridors' approach to urban intensification. Considers that this approach does not recognise that retirement villages are required in all areas. Also considers the requirement for developments to be served by public open space and other social infrastructure may be overly restrictive for retirement villages which provide on-site amenities for their residents. Considers that the use of the phrasing 'are located in' is very	Opposes UFD-03 (Strategic Direction) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				restrictive. As large areas of the city have been zoned for medium to high density development (i.e. the Medium Density and High Density Residential Zones) the application of this policy within those zones has the potential to further limit the area within which such developments are supported. Considers that this is contrary to the purpose / function of the Enabling Housing Act.							
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.22	Amend	Opposes in part the 'centres and transport corridors' approach to urban intensification. Considers that this approach does not recognise that retirement villages are required in all areas. Also considers the requirement for developments to be served by public open space and other social infrastructure may be overly restrictive for retirement villages which provide on-site amenities for their residents. Considers that the use of the phrasing 'are located in' is very restrictive. As large areas of the city have been zoned for medium to high density development (i.e. the Medium Density and High Density Residential Zones) the application of this policy within those zones has the potential to further limit the area within which such developments are supported. Considers that this is contrary to the purpose / function of the Enabling Housing Act.	Amend UFD-03 (Strategic Direction) as follows: Medium to high density and assisted housing developments are located <u>encouraged</u> in areas that are: 1. Connected to the transport network and served by multi-modal transport options; or 2. Within or near a Centre Zone or other area with many employment opportunities; and Served by public <u>or on-site</u> open space and other social infrastructure.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Woolworths New Zealand	359.17	Support	UFD-03 is supported.	Retain Objective UFD-03 (Medium to high density and assisted housing developments...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.80	Amend	Considers that the references to 'assisted housing' should be removed from UFD-03.	Amend the Urban Form and Development chapter to remove all references to 'assisted housing' including and not limited to UFD-03 (Medium to high density and assisted housing developments...).	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.81	Support in part	Objective UFD-03 is partially supported.	Retain Objective UFD-03 (Medium to high density and assisted housing...) with amendment.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.82	Amend	Considers that Objective UFD-03 should be amended to enable higher density residential living across the city, including the city centre zone. Aligned to the NPSUD.	Amend Objective UFD-03 (Medium to high density and assisted housing...) as follows: Medium to high density and assisted housing developments are located in areas that are: 1. Connected to the transport network and served by multi-modal transport options; or 2. Within or near a <u>City Centre Zone or</u> a Centre Zone or other area with many employment	Reject	No	84.28	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.

					opportunities; and Served by public open space and other social infrastructure.						
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Ministry of Education	400.15	Support	The Council has an obligation under the NPS-UD to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes social infrastructure and schools) is provided in urban growth and development (see Policy 10 and 3.5 of Subpart 1 of Part 3: Implementation, in particular).	Retain UFD-03 (Medium to high density and assisted housing developments are located in areas that are...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.74	Not specified	Incompatible urban development, particularly greenfield development, has the potential to constrain and/or curtail the operation, development and use of regionally significant infrastructure. Urban development should not be enabled or encouraged where it has the potential to adversely affect the operations of the Airport. [See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 of original submission for full reason]	Delete Objective UFD-02.	Reject	No	44.31	Oppose	[Inferred reference to submission 406.74]	Disallow
								89.117	Oppose	Kāinga Ora seeks to retain UFD-02 as notified. The proposed relief sought provides a potential conflict between urban development around the airport and the airport. Compatible is a relatively high threshold which could have an unintended consequence of unnecessarily limiting development.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.75	Oppose in part	Incompatible medium and high density housing development, has the potential to constrain and/or curtail the operation, development and use of regionally significant infrastructure. Urban development should not be enabled or encouraged where it has the potential to adversely affect the operations of the Airport. [See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 from original submission for full reason]	Opposes UFD-03 (Medium/high density and assisted housing developments) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No	44.32	Oppose	[Inferred reference to submission 406.75]	Disallow
								89.118	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that the effects of medium and high density housing development can be managed so as not to constrain and / or curtail the airport operation. Measures proposed in the PDP such as acoustic insulation and ventilation requirements for noise sensitive activities within the Air Noise Overlays will manage the potential effects without constraining development. The neighbourhoods surrounding the airport are well placed for high density development due to transport network, public open spaces and social infrastructure and proximity to employment and commercial activities.	Disallow Kāinga Ora seeks that UFD-03 is retained and amended as per their original submission.
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.76	Amend	Incompatible medium and high density housing development, has the potential to constrain and/or curtail the operation, development and use of regionally significant infrastructure. Urban development should not be enabled or encouraged where it has the potential to adversely affect the operations of the Airport. [See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 from original submission for full reason]	Amend UFD-03 (Medium/high density and assisted housing developments) as follows: Medium to high density and assisted housing developments are located in areas that are: 1. Connected to the transport network and served by multi-modal transport options; or 2. Within or near a Centre Zone or other area with many employment opportunities; and 3. Served by public open space and other social infrastructure.; and <u>Compatible with surrounding regionally significant infrastructure.</u>	Reject	No	44.33	Oppose	[Inferred reference to submission 406.76]	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.77	Amend	Incompatible medium and high density housing development, has the potential to constrain and/or curtail the operation, development and use of regionally significant infrastructure.	Delete Objective UFD-03	Reject	No	44.34	Oppose	[Inferred reference to submission 406.77]	Disallow
								103.2	Oppose	WIAL is justified in its concerns around reverse sensitivity to airport noise. However, an	Disallow

				Urban development should not be enabled or encouraged where it has the potential to adversely affect the operations of the Airport. [See paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 from original submission for full reason]						appropriate response would be to allow development where the developer is required to mitigate the effects of airport noise when developing.	
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.43	Amend	Considers that UFD-03 is not consistent with the medium density residential standards as it appears to limit areas in which medium density housing is to be provided.	Amend UFD-03 (Medium to high density and assisted housing developments...) as follows: Medium to high High density and assisted housing developments are located in areas that are: ...	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-03	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.30	Support in part	Considers there is insufficient provision for papakainga in the proposed District Plan.	Retain UFD-03 (Medium to high density and assisted housing developments...) as notified, subject to consistent use of 'active partnership' requested in subsequent submission points	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-04	Wellington City Council	266.57	Amend	Considers that the housing bottom lines are to be inserted in the PDP without using Schedule 1 and are operative from that point.	Amend by replacing to left of UFD-04 "P1 Sch1" with a red gavel. Remove P1 Sch 1	Accept	Yes	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-04	Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.31	Support	Considers that it is important that Council encourages development that will support a more compact City.	Retain UFD-04 (Housing bottom lines that need to be met or exceeded) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-04	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.20	Not specified	Neutral' on provision. The term land development capacity in UFD-04 is applied in such a way as to emphasise the term development infrastructure. The term development infrastructure is exclusive of Additional Infrastructure – thus, by default, excluding the provision of key electricity distribution from this strategic objective. The high-level direction provided for in the PDP is supported, however, this support is based on a suitable level of recognition of the fundamental role and service a secure supply of electricity provides to the Urban Form and Development of the City. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-04	Woolworths New Zealand	359.18	Support	UFD-04 is supported provided that Council has an evidential basis which supports the numbers referenced in Objective UFD-04.	Retain Objective UFD-04 (In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-04	Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.8	Amend	Considers that UFD-04 (In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity to meet expected...) should be amended to have its numbers put into the context of the housing consents granted in Wellington in the last three years. The Council can guide and encourage the location and timing of the development capacity by zoning, objectives, policies, rules and development infrastructure to meet the expected demand. The expected demand figures specified in UFD-04 (In order to achieve	Amend UFD-04 (In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity to meet expected...) to clarify demand figures according to past numbers of housing consents granted in Wellington.	Reject See body of report	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				<p>sufficient, feasible land development capacity to meet expected...) needs to be put into the context of the numbers of housing consents granted in Wellington in the last three years (2019 - 2021).</p> <p>The submitter notes that while there will be lag between the granting of building consents and completion of the property, the current rate of building consents appears to far exceed the demand figures specified. To meet the demand figures (including competitiveness margin) for the full thirty year period requires only 1,220 new house per year which is significantly less than the number of building consents granted in each of the years 2019 - 2021.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason and figures]</p>							
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O4	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.83	Support in part	Objective UFD-O4 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective UFD-O4 (In order to achieve sufficient,...) with amendment.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O4	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.84	Amend	<p>Considers that Objective UFD-O4 should be amended to clarify that the specified development capacity is a minimum to be provided in the District Plan rather than a target.</p> <p>In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity to meet expected housing demand, the following housing bottom lines below are to be met or exceeded in the short-medium and long term in Wellington City as contained in the Wellington Regional Housing and Business Capacity Assessment (Housing Update 2022).</p> <p>...</p>	Amend Objective UFD-O4 (In order to achieve sufficient,...)as follows:	Reject	No	96.9	Oppose	Changing the requirement to 'exceed' capacity is not warranted. The target for the District Plan should be to provide sufficient land. Making the target more than this makes it meaningless and is not warranted. Specified development capacity already builds in extensive buffers for feasibility – therefore it does not need to be 'exceeded'. The current definition meets the requirements of the NPS-UD. Anything else could have perverse outcomes through 'over upzoning'.	Disallow
								117.9	Oppose	Changing the requirement to 'exceed' capacity is not warranted. The target for the District Plan should be to provide sufficient land. Making the target more than this makes it meaningless and is not warranted. Specified development capacity already builds in extensive buffers for feasibility – therefore it does not need to be 'exceeded'. The current definition meets the requirements of the NPS-UD. Anything else could have perverse outcomes through 'over upzoning'.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O4	Investore Property Limited	405.28	Support	<p>Supports the recognition of the need to provide sufficient development capacity for housing and business land.</p> <p>The NPS-UD requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Retain UFD-O4 (Strategic Objectives) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-O4	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.44	Support in part	Support UFD-O4 in part.	Retain UFD-O4 (In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity...), with amendments.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.45	Amend	Considers that UFD-O4 should acknowledge the need to deliver affordable housing. Submitter	Amend UFD-O4 (In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Development / UFD-04				considers that Wellington's affordability issues are well-documented. A lack of affordable housing risks harming the City's ability to attract workers and to sustain a vibrant arts scene.	development capacity...) to acknowledge the need to deliver affordable housing.						
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-04	Newtown Residents' Association	440.14	Not specified	Considers that the amount of prescribed housing to meet before 2030 stated in UFD-04 could be met within Medium Density Residential Zones and does not require 6- storey developments.	Not specified.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-04	Stride Investment Management Limited	470.12	Support	Supports UFD-04 (In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity...)	Retain as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-04	The Thorndon Society Inc	487.2	Amend	Considers that the demand figures in UFD-04 should be further broken down to better determine the real demand and housing needs. Considers that the figures need clarification over what part of the need is by families (who may need larger properties with more land) and what part by individual people and couples who may enjoy apartment or town house living.	Seeks that the demand figures in UFD-04 (In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity ...) should be broken down further to better determine the real demand and housing needs.	Reject	No	69.84	Support	Break down housing demand figures Infrastructure capacity insufficient – limit development Construction of buildings for business purposes should not be permitted in a residential area.	Allow
								111.75	Support	No specific reason provided.	Allow
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-04	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.31	Support in part	Considers there is insufficient provision for papakainga in the proposed District Plan.	Retain UFD-04 (In order to achieve sufficient, feasible land development capacity to meet expected housing demand...) as notified, subject to consistent use of 'active partnership' requested in subsequent submission points	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Woolworths New Zealand	359.19	Support	UFD-05 is supported provided that there is actual sufficient land development capacity available to meet the short-, medium- and long-term business land needs of the City as identified in Objective UFD-05. With particular regard to business land, it is currently unclear if adequate supply has been made in accordance with the Wellington Regional Housing and Business Capacity Assessment.	Retain Objective UFD-05 (Sufficient land development capacity is available...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.17	Support	Supports the recognition of the need to provide sufficient development capacity for housing and business land. The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments. Argosy supports the strategic direction set by the NPS-UD. The feedback that Argosy provides on the provisions below seeks to ensure that the rules and standards in the District Plan enable this outcome	Retain Objective UFD-05 as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.85	Support in part	Objective UFD-05 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective UFD-05 (Sufficient land development capacity...) with amendment.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.86	Amend	Considers that Objective UFD-05 should be amended to clarify that the specified development capacity is a minimum to be provided in the District Plan rather than a target and feasible development should be provided for.	Amend Objective UFD-05 (Sufficient land development capacity...) as follows: At least sufficient, feasible land development capacity is available to meet the short, medium, and long-term business land needs of the City, as identified in the Wellington Regional Housing and Business Capacity Assessment.	Reject	No	96.10	Oppose	The target for the District Plan should be to provide sufficient land. Making the target more than this makes it meaningless and is not warranted. Specified development capacity already builds in extensive buffers for feasibility – therefore it does not need to be 'exceeded'. The current definition meets the requirements of the NPS-UD. Anything else could have perverse outcomes through 'over upzoning'.	Disallow
								117.10	Oppose	The target for the District Plan should be to provide sufficient land. Making the target more than this makes it meaningless and is not warranted. Specified development capacity already builds in extensive buffers for feasibility – therefore it does not need to be 'exceeded'. The current definition meets the requirements of the NPS-UD. Anything else could have perverse outcomes through 'over upzoning'.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Investore Property Limited	405.29	Support	Supports the recognition of the need to provide sufficient development capacity for housing and business land. The NPS-UD requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Retain UFD-05 (Strategic Objectives) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.46	Support in part	Support UFD-05 in part.	Retain UFD-05 (Sufficient land development capacity is available...) with amendments.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.47	Amend	Considers that UFD-05 should acknowledge the need to deliver affordable housing. Submitter considers that Wellington's affordability issues are well-documented. A lack of affordable housing risks harming the City's ability to attract workers and to sustain a vibrant arts scene.	Amend UFD-05 (Sufficient land development capacity is available...) to acknowledge the need to deliver affordable housing.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Stride Investment Management Limited	470.13	Support	Supports UFD-05 (Sufficient land development capacity is available...)	Retain as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-05	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.32	Support in part	Considers there is insufficient provision for papakainga in the proposed District Plan.	Retain UFD-05 (Sufficient land development capacity is available to meet the short-, medium- and long-term business land needs...) as notified, subject to consistent use of 'active partnership' requested in subsequent submission points	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Oranga Tamariki	83.4	Support	Oranga Tamariki support this objective which now specifically provides for supported residential care, as sought through the Draft Plan feedback. This achieves consistency with the underlying residential zone rules which provide for	Retain UFD-06 (Strategic Objectives) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

				supported residential care activities (up to 10 residents) as a Permitted activity.							
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.9	Oppose	Considers that the definition of “residential activity” entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama, and therefore a separate definition of “supported residential care activities” is unnecessary. Such activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama’s supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety. However, should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of “supported residential care activity”, then the wording of Strategic Objective UFD-06 (which references and enables supported residential care activities), should be retained as notified	Seeks that the references to “supported residential care activity” from Strategic Objective UFD-06 (Variety of housing types...) are removed.	Reject	No	89.6	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the deletion of the reference to supported residential care activities and its definition. The objective appropriately describes the range of activities expected across the city.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.10	Oppose in part	Considers that the definition of “residential activity” entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama, and therefore a separate definition of “supported residential care activities” is unnecessary. Such activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama’s supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety. However, should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of “supported residential care activity”, then the wording of Strategic Objective UFD-06 (which references and enables supported residential care activities), should be retained as notified	If council are to retain the “supported residential care activity” definition, then the wording of Strategic Objective UFD-06 (variety of housing types...) should be retained as notified.	Accept	No	89.7	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the deletion of the reference to supported residential care activities and its definition. The objective appropriately describes the range of activities expected across the city.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Phillippa O’Connor	289.4	Support	Supports the Objective UFD-06 as notified.	Retain UFD-06 (A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing, supported residential care, and papakainga options, are available across the City to meet the community’s diverse social, cultural, and economic housing needs.) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.32	Support	Considers that it is important that Council encourages development that will support a more compact City.	Retain UFD-06 (A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing, supported residential care, and papakainga options, are available	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

					across the City...) as notified.						
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.15	Support	Support the recognition of papakāinga housing options in Urban Form and Development – Objective 6.	Retain UFD-06 (variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing, supported residential care, and papakainga options) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.23	Support in part	Supports UFD-06 to the extent it reflects the MDRS Objective 2.	Retain UFD-06 (Strategic Direction) and seeks amendment.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.24	Support in part	Supports UFD-06 to the extent it reflects the MDRS Objective 2.	Seeks amendment to UFD-06 (Strategic Direction) to more closely reflect MDRS Objective 2.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Woolworths New Zealand	359.20	Support	UFD-06 is supported.	Retain Objective UFD-06 (A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures,...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.18	Support	Supports the creation of 'well-functioning urban environments consistent with the NPS- UD. The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments. Argosy supports the strategic direction set by the NPS-UD. The feedback that Argosy provides on the provisions below seeks to ensure that the rules and standards in the District Plan enable this outcome	Retain Objective UFD-06 as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.52	Amend	Seeks clarification of the use of papakāinga.	Amend Objective UFD-06 to the following: A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing, supported residential care, and papakāinga papakāinga options, are available across the City to meet the community's diverse social, cultural, and economic housing needs. [Inferred decision requested] [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	No See recommendat ion for further work.	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.87	Amend	Considers that the references to 'assisted housing' should be removed from UFD-06.	Amend the Urban Form and Development chapter to remove all references to 'assisted housing' including and not limited to UFD-06 (A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures,...)	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development /	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.88	Support in part	Objective UFD-06 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective UFD-06 (A variety of housing types,...) with amendment.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

UFD-06											
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.89	Amend	Considers that Objective UFD-06 should be amended to clarify that the tenure is not relevant to achieving quality urban environments, but the range of types and sizes of housing are.	Amend Objective UFD-06 (A variety of housing types,...) as follows: A variety of housing types and sizes and tenures, including assisted housing, supported residential care, and papakainga options , are available across the City to meet the community's diverse social, cultural, and economic housing needs.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Metlifecare Limited	413.6	Oppose	Consider that as currently drafted this objective does not recognise the importance of housing being able to provide both social and health benefits in the community.	Seeks to ensure that this objective recognises that housing must not only meet social, cultural and economic housing needs, it must also meet health needs.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Metlifecare Limited	413.7	Amend	Consider that as currently drafted this objective does not recognise the importance of housing being able to provide both social and health benefits in the community.	Seeks that UDF-06 is amended as follows: A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing, supported residential care, and papakainga options, are available across the City to meet the community's diverse social, cultural, and economic housing needs and to reflect demand.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.48	Support in part	Support UFD-06 in part.	Retain UFD-06 (A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing...) with amendments.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.49	Amend	Considers that UFD-06 should acknowledge the need to deliver affordable housing. Submitter considers that Wellington's affordability issues are well-documented. A lack of affordable housing risks harming the City's ability to attract workers and to sustain a vibrant arts scene.	Amend UFD-06 (A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing...) to acknowledge the need to deliver affordable housing.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.50	Amend	Considers that UFD-06 should acknowledge the need to deliver affordable housing. Submitter considers that Wellington's affordability issues are well-documented. A lack of affordable housing risks harming the City's ability to attract workers and to sustain a vibrant arts scene.	Amend UFD-06 (A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing...) as follows: A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing, supported residential care, and papakainga options, and affordable housing options , are available across the City to meet the community's diverse social, cultural, and economic housing needs.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.33	Support in part	Considers there is insufficient provision for papakainga in the proposed District Plan.	Retain UFD-06 (A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing, supported residential care, and papakainga options...) as notified, subject to consistent use of 'active partnership' requested in subsequent submission points	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-06	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.34	Support in part	Supports reference to papakainga in UFD-06.	Retain UFD-06 (A variety of housing types, sizes and tenures, including assisted housing, supported residential care, and papakainga options...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Oranga Tamariki	83.5	Amend	<p>Oranga Tamariki seek amendments to UFD-06 to provide specific direction in relation to community needs and well-being.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed amended objectives can better provide for Part 2 of the RMA in relation to people and communities providing for their social, economic and well-being and for their health and safety.</p>	<p>Amend UDF-07 (Strategic objectives) as follows:</p> <p>Development supports the creation of liveable, well-functioning urban environments that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety now and into the future.</p> <p>Development will achieve this by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Being accessible and well-designed; 2. Supporting sustainable travel choices, including active and micro mobility modes; 3. Being serviced by the necessary infrastructure appropriate to the intensity, scale and function of the development and urban environment; 4. Being socially inclusive; 5. Being ecologically sensitive; 6. Respecting of the City's historic heritage; 7. Providing for community well-being; and 8. Adapting over time and being responsive to an evolving, more intensive surrounding context.; <p><u>and</u> <u>Provides for community well-being.</u></p>	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark) and	99.8	Support	UFD-07 is supported as it appropriately recognises the need for a well-functioning urban environment to be served by the necessary infrastructure appropriate to the intensity, scale and function of the development and urban environment.	Retain Objective UFD-07 as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

	Vodafone New Zealand Limited (Vodafone)										
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.33	Support	Considers that it is important that Council encourages development that will support a more compact City.	Retain UFD-07 (Development supports the creation of a liveable, well-functioning urban environment) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.25	Support in part	Supports UFD-07 to the extent it reflects MDRS Objective 1. However, is concerned the objective is overly directive as to how this outcome will be achieved, through listing 8 broad and undefined matters that need to be satisfied.	Retain UFD-07 (Strategic Direction) and seeks amendment.	Reject See body of report	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.26	Amend	Supports UFD-07 to the extent it reflects MDRS Objective 1. However, is concerned the objective is overly directive as to how this outcome will be achieved, through listing 8 broad and undefined matters that need to be satisfied.	Seeks amendment to UFD-07 (Strategic Direction) to acknowledge that development will not achieve all of the listed matters in all cases.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Wellington Electricity Lines Limited	355.21	Support	Supports Objective UFD-07 for its effective messaging as to the need of the electricity distribution network in achieving well-functioning urban environments.	Retain UFD-07 of the Urban Form and Development Objective chapter as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Woolworths New Zealand	359.21	Support	UFD-07 is supported.	Retain Objective UFD-07 (Development supports the creation of a liveable,...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Waka Kotahi	370.69	Support	Supports this strategic objective as written.	Retain Strategic Objective UFD-07 as notified.	Accept in part	No	72.16	Support	Supports objective. Considers the relief sought should be allowed because it will (a) will promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore consistent with Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Enabling Housing Supply Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act); (b) is consistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Wellington City; and (f) is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Allow
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Southern Cross Healthcare Limited	380.27	Support	Supports strategic objective UFD-07 as it recognises that development will support the creation of a liveable, well-functioning urban environment that enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, and this will be achieved by environments adapting over time to a more intensive surrounding context.	Retain Urban Form and Development strategic objective UFD-07 as notified	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.90	Support	Objective UFD-07 is generally supported.	Retain Objective UFD-07 (Development supports the creation...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Ministry of Education	400.16	Support in part	Requests the inclusion of 'additional infrastructure' to be included within UFD-07. Under the NPS-UD and the Definitions Chapter of the Proposed District Plan, educational facilities are included in the definition of 'additional infrastructure'. This will ensure that subdivision and development include provision for the expansion of existing or new educational facilities to accommodate the demand of development.	Amend UFD-07 (Development supports the creation of...) as follows: ... Development will achieve this by: ... 3. Being serviced by the necessary infrastructure and <u>additional infrastructure</u> appropriate to the intensity, scale and function of the development and urban environment; ...	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Investore Property Limited	405.30	Support	Supports the creation of well-functioning urban environments under UFD-07, that is consistent with the direction set out in the NPS-UD. The NPS-UD requires intensification in urban areas and sufficient development capacity that is of a form and in locations that meet the diverse needs of communities and encourages well-functioning, liveable urban environments [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Retain UFD-07 (Strategic Objectives) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.78	Oppose in part	Poorly sited noise sensitive activity has the potential to constrain and/or curtail the operation, development and use of regionally significant infrastructure. Considers that such activities should not be enabled or encouraged where it has the potential to adversely affect the operations of the Airport. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 for full reason]	Opposes UFD-07 as is and seeks amendment.	Reject	No	89.119	Oppose	Kāinga Ora considers that the effects of medium and high density housing development can be managed so as not to constrain and / or curtail the airport operation. Measures proposed in the PDP such as acoustic insulation and ventilation requirements for noise sensitive activities within the Air Noise Overlays will manage the potential effects without constraining development. The neighbourhoods surrounding the airport are well placed for high density development due to transport network, public open spaces and social infrastructure and proximity to employment and commercial activities.	Disallow Kāinga Ora seeks that UFD-07 is retained as notified
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.79	Amend	Poorly sited noise sensitive activity has the potential to constrain and/or curtail the operation, development and use of regionally significant infrastructure. Considers that such activities should not be enabled or encouraged where it has the potential to adversely affect the operations of the Airport. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 for full reason]	Amend UFD-07 (Development supports the creation of a liveable, well-functioning urban environment) as follows: ... 7. Providing for community well-being; and 8. Adapting over time and being responsive to an evolving, more intensive surrounding context.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

					and Avoiding the effects of reverse sensitivity on Regionally Significant Infrastructure.						
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Wellington International Airport Ltd	406.80	Amend	Poorly sited noise sensitive activity has the potential to constrain and/or curtail the operation, development and use of regionally significant infrastructure. Considers that such activities should not be enabled or encouraged where it has the potential to adversely affect the operations of the Airport. [See original submission paragraphs 4.11 to 4.15 for full reason]	Delete Objective UFD-07.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.1	Amend	Considers that UFD-07 is too extensive in its demands on development and is not consistent with the more permissive direction in the medium density housing standards and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD). The submitter considers that the items mentioned are generally dealt with elsewhere in the PDP.	Seeks that UFD-07 is reviewed for alignment with the medium density housing standards, NPS-UD and the balance of the Proposed District Plan. [If the objective is not deleted in its entirety]	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.51	Oppose	Considers that UFD-07 is too extensive in its demands on development and is not consistent with the more permissive direction in the medium density housing standards and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD). The submitter considers that the items mentioned are generally dealt with elsewhere in the PDP.	Delete UFD-07 (Development supports the creation of a liveable, well-functioning...) in its entirety.	Reject	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Stride Investment Management Limited	470.14	Support	Supports UFD-07 (Development supports the creation of a liveable...)	Retain as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-07	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.35	Support in part	Considers there is insufficient provision for papakainga in the proposed District Plan.	Retain UFD-07 (Development supports the creation of a liveable, well-functioning urban environment...) as notified, subject to consistent use of 'active partnership' requested in subsequent submission points	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-08	Woolworths New Zealand	359.22	Support	UFD-08 is supported.	Retain Objective UFD-08 (Areas of identified special character are recognised...) as notified.	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-08	Waka Kotahi	370.70	Amend	Considers it would be helpful if the District Plan identified under what specific circumstances "where possible" pertains to. As currently written the objective is subjective.	Amend Strategic Objective UFD-08 to clarify what 'where possible' pertains to.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA

Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-08	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.91	Oppose	Objective UFD-08 is opposed due to the recognition of 'special character' at the strategic level of the Plan. This is more appropriately addressed through the relevant zone provisions and precincts. Character is not a NPSUD qualifying matter and as these are not referenced here then neither should special character.	Delete Objective UFD-08 (Areas of identified special character...) in its entirety.	Reject	No	7.1	Oppose	The NPSUD makes provision for "any other matters" determined by the Council to be a qualifying matter. Character Precincts are important to protect the character and heritage of Wellington City in general, and Mount Cook in particular. [Inferred reference to submission 391.91]	Disallow
								63.1	Oppose	Considers that the original submission states that Character is not a NPSUD qualifying matter. We disagree - NPS-UD has provision for 'any other matter' determined by Council to be a qualifying matter. [Inferred reference to 391.91]	Disallow
								69.11	Oppose	WCC summary of submission reads: Objective UFD-08 is opposed due to the recognition of 'special character' at the strategic level of the Plan. This is more appropriately addressed through the relevant zone provisions and precincts. Character is not a NPSUD qualifying matter and as these are not referenced here then neither should special character. Wellington is a boutique capital with unique characteristics that are highly valued and celebrated for collectively adding to the charm of this unique city. The special character of the city's inner residential areas are a well recognised part of the city's international reputation, and these deserve robust consideration and planning control. Special character precincts would seem to enable a more rigorous and sustainable control.	Disallow
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-08	Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.52	Support	Supports the direction of UFD-08.	Retain UFD-08 (Areas of identified special character are recognised...) as notified.	Accept	No	NA	NA	NA	NA
Strategic Direction / Urban Form and Development / UFD-08	Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.36	Support in part	Considers there is insufficient provision for papakainga in the proposed District Plan.	Retain UFD-08 (Areas of identified special character are recognised and new development within those areas...) as notified, subject to consistent use of 'active partnership' requested in subsequent submission points	Accept in part	No	NA	NA	NA	NA