

Wellington City Proposed District Plan

Stream 2 – Part 3, Residential Zones - Part 6: Design Guide - General Residential Design Guide Papakāinga Design Guide

Appendix B – Recommended Responses to Submissions and Further Submissions

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---------|
| Residential Design Guide | Page 3 |
| Papakāinga Design Guide | Page 26 |
| General points on Design Guides | Page 28 |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|---|-------------------|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Nick Ruane | 61.6 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Opposes G37 of the Residential Design Guide in its current form and seeks amendment. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.186 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.186 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Nick Ruane | 61.7 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Seeks that G37 of the Residential Design Guide is amended to: "Entrances should <u>must</u> be of adequate dimensions to provide universal access for all and allow for movement from a wide range of users, including moving furniture and wheelchairs." | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.187 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.187 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Nick Ruane | 61.8 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Opposes G39 of the Residential Design Guide in its current form and seeks amendment. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.188 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.188 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Nick Ruane | 61.9 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Seeks that G39 of the Residential Design Guide is amended to: "Dwellings on the ground floor should <u>must</u> have a step-free entry" | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.189 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.189 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Nick Ruane | 61.10 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Opposes G116 of the Residential Design Guide in its current form and seeks amendment. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.190 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.190 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|---|-------------------|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Nick Ruane | 61.11 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Seeks that G116 of the Residential Design Guide is amended to: "Where possible, ensure ground level dwellings and all habitable rooms are designed for accessible and practical use. - Consider having the kitchen, a bathroom and a bedroom on the ground level. - Consider transition between rooms, and the ability to turn and manoeuvre mobility devices." | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.191 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.191 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Nick Ruane | 61.12 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Opposes G117 of the Residential Design Guide with decision requested not stated. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.192 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.192 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Nick Ruane | 61.13 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Opposes G132 of the Residential Design Guide with decision requested not stated. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.193 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.193 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Nick Ruane | 61.14 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Opposes G133 of the Residential Design Guide in its current form and seeks amendment. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.194 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.194 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Nick Ruane | 61.15 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Seeks that G133 is amended to: Provide ground-level access that is accessible by people using wheelchairs, and design units with reference to which is compliant with NZ standards for access and mobility" | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.195 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.195 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Nick Ruane | 61.16 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Opposes G53 of the Residential Design Guide in its current form and seeks amendment. | Reject. | No. |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|---|-------------------|--|---------------|---|---|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.196 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guide/s / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.196 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guide/s / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Nick Ruane | 61.17 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Seeks that G53 is amended to: Developments designed for limited mobility users should must provide an accessible link between parking spaces and their associated unit. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.197 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as The RVA is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.197 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to expressly exclude retirement villages from applying the Design Guides. To the extent these matters are relevant to retirement villages, they do not require council oversight as Ryman is best placed to understand residents' needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Brett McKay | 69.3 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Opposes the Residential Design Guide relating to residential development within the inner residential suburbs of the city are opposed. | Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone provisions are recrafted to achieve reasonable intensification whilst maintaining and enhancing the existing valued housing stock. | Reject. | No. |
| Richard Murrcott | FS71.4 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | Reasonable, well-regulated intensification in MDRZ's is OK. Unreasonable intensification is not OK. Intensification that jeopardises things that are valued by communities (liveability), and risk things that are valuable for the city's reputation overall (its character and heritage), may be considered imprudent or irresponsible. The city doesn't need to rush into this. This increases the risks. The stakes are high; one mistake at this point could jeopardise a lot over the next 10-30yrs. | Allow | Reject. | |
| Dennis Michael Hunt | 119.3 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that refined design is key to the future of the area. The current design guidelines do not exhibit refinement and are based on box like structures and words which read well but do not contemplate how the written features would be practically incorporated. Sun and park-like areas should be prioritised and that exposed decks at higher levels in apartment buildings are not often used primarily due to wind. The steep terrain is advantageous for the creation of sheltered, sunny outdoor areas but would still require at least 30 metres between six-storey apartment blocks on the north east facing slope. | Seeks that more refined design concepts are established for the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) block of properties between Aurora Terrace, Bolton Street, the Urban Motorway, and Wesley Road. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.64 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Not specified | Considers that the City Outcomes Contribution (G137) is an interesting methodology, but there are many issues to be addressed for this to be effective and/or suitably responsive to context and the effects that may arise with 'over height' buildings. [Refer to original submission for full reasons] | Seeks that G137 (City Outcomes Contribution) is removed from the Residential Design Guide. | Addressed in Hearing Stream 4 | |
| Johnsonville Community Association Inc | FS114.49 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | Considers that while large scale residential developments "will positively contribute to addressing future challenges confronting the city", such developments will also likely have a severe adverse impact on the neighbouring properties. Having a 6 storey development under NDRZ zone rules occur next door will have a major impact on neighbouring home owners and having a 7, 8 or higher development under City Outcome Rules will only have a greater adverse local impact. It is particularly objectionable that a development can increase its height by simply "satisfying the relevant design guide". It is unclear what would enable a development to meet this criteria but the design guide does not include any significantly onerous requirements ... in fact "The guidance that follows here is ... to ensure best practice design approaches and encourage built outcomes." This one provision essentially increases the maximum height in these zones by 1 storey to 7 storeys for MDRZ and 2 storeys to 10 storeys in the Metropolitan. The JCA supports the encouragement of significant residential developments but it is unfair to support this by rewarding such developments with height increases beyond PDP maximums. This permits developments that can be out of scale to the area in which it is built with major local adverse impacts on amenity and property values. | Allow / Seeks to delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety. | Addressed in Hearing Stream 4 | |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|---------------|--|---|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.65 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the City Outcomes Contribution (G137) is an interesting methodology, but there are many issues to be addressed for this to be effective and/or suitably responsive to context and the effects that may arise with 'over height' buildings. [Refer to original submission for full reasons] | Seeks that the extent of scope to increase height and public/neighbour involvement in that, and remove possibility for height to extend above the permitted envelope to be delivered using the City Outcomes Contribution mechanism in the residential zones is reconsidered. | Addressed in Hearing Stream 4 | |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.66 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Not specified | Considers that the City Outcomes Contribution (G137) is an interesting methodology, but there are many issues to be addressed for this to be effective and/or suitably responsive to context and the effects that may arise with 'over height' buildings. [Refer to original submission for full reasons] | Seeks that the workability and effectiveness of the City Outcomes Contribution methodology is tested. | Addressed in Hearing Stream 4 | |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.67 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the City Outcomes Contribution (G137) is an interesting methodology, but there are many issues to be addressed for this to be effective and/or suitably responsive to context and the effects that may arise with 'over height' buildings. [Refer to original submission for full reasons] | Seeks that the content of the G137 (City Outcomes Contribution) is refined with consideration of the matters identified. | Addressed in Hearing Stream 4 | |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.68 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G12 and G13 say more or less than same thing and should be combined to avoid repetition. | Seeks that G12 and G13 (Designing with Topography) of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide are integrated. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.69 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the title 'Responding to whakapapa of place' under the broad title of 'Responding to the natural environment' would be better as 'Responding to context' as many of the matters addressed are responses to the cultural and built environment. | Amend heading 'Responding to whakapapa of place' as follows: <u>'Responding to context'</u> | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.70 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G1 has two lists and multiple overlapping layers, and that a single much tighter list should be used. Considers that the level of detail required in this guideline will be too much for some projects. Considers that context analysis should be framed around the scope of the project. Considers that there is a focus on existing context but no recognition of planned urban context and character. Considers that when there is no specific requirement to respond to matters such as materials, finishes and textures, this is unnecessary detail. | Amend G1 (Responding to whakapapa of place) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: ... "...should include, <u>where relevant</u> , the following:" | Accept in part. | Yes. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.71 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G2 repeats G1 and these two guidelines should be integrated. | Seeks that G1 (Responding to whakapapa of place) and G2 (Responding to whakapapa of place) of the Residential Design Guide are integrated. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.72 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the content under the subheadings 'Vegetation and Planting', 'Urban Ecology' and 'Carbon reduction - natural environment' (G3 to G10) should be rationalised as trees and landscaping are covered under all three headings. | Seeks that the content of G3 to G6 (Vegetation and Planting), G7 (Urban Ecology) and G8 to G10 (Carbon reduction - natural environment) of the Residential Design Guide is rationalised. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.73 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G12 is better located in the stormwater section. | Seeks that G12 (Designing with topography) of the Residential Design Guide is moved to sit under the heading 'Stormwater'. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.74 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G16 should be edited - recommends either listing the intended methods in full, or listing best practice water sensitive design, but not both as this is repetitive. | Seeks that G16 (Stormwater) of the Residential Design Guide is edited to avoid repetition. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.75 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers the validity of the uses of greywater should be verified. No mention is made of toilet flushing or irrigation, which are common uses for grey water. | Seeks that G18 (Water conservation) of the Residential Design Guide is amended. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.76 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Not specified | Considers that G25 is very broad, is undefined and its actual meaning is uncertain. | Seeks that G25 (Ground floor interface and frontage) of the Residential Design Guide is edited or deleted. | Reject. | No. |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.77 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Not specified | Considers that G27 may be relevant for ground floor non-residential activity in centres, but does not fit well with private dining rooms in houses or apartments. | Not specified. | Accept in part. | Yes. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.78 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers that G31 covers matters that must be addressed by the Heritage Design Guide so should be deleted | Seeks that G31 (Ground floor interface and frontage) of the Residential Design Guide is deleted. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.79 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers that G33 is a construction management issue not an issue for the proposed building design. | Seeks that G33 (Ground floor interface and frontage) of the Residential Design Guide is deleted. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.80 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G37 and G39 cover the same matter and should be combined. | Seeks that G37 and G39 (Entrances) of the Residential Design Guide are combined. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.81 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers that G40, relating to canopies and verandas over building entrances, does not apply to residential development, and if the development is in a Centres it is covered by the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide. G38 relates to cover at entries. | Seeks that G40 (Entrances) of the Residential Design Guide is deleted. | Accept in part. | Yes. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.82 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G44 should allow a portion of the front fence to be high - e.g. not more than 50%, to allow privacy to front yards where these are the dwelling's only sunny area. | Seeks that G44 (Fencing) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to allow for a portion of a front fence to be high. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.83 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that 'low' in G44 should be clarified. | Clarify the use of the word 'low' in G44 (Fencing) of the Residential Design Guide. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.84 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that while G49 will be appropriate in some circumstances, it wont in others. | Seeks that G49 (Connections for people) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to acknowledge the subtleties of width being suitable for location and function. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.85 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G50 conflates street with external accessways, and does not apply to streets. This should be added. | Seeks that G50 (Garages, carports and car pads) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to state that this guideline does not apply to external streets. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.86 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support in part | Considers that G54 is sound in principle but undefined, leading to uncertainty. | Clarify G54 (Vehicle crossings and basement entries) of the Residential Design Guide. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.87 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G55 is unnecessary in some instances, where a shared surface approach may be both suitably safe and the optimal solution. | Seeks that G55 (Grouped parking and shared access at grade) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to allow for a shared surface approach in some circumstances. [Inferred decision requested] | Accept. | Yes. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.88 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | The italicised text under G55 does not relate to the subject of the guideline. | Remove the italicised text under G55 (Grouped parking and shared access at grade) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Planting is also important in ensuring visual amenity, stormwater treatment, shade and screening of grouped carpark spaces. | Accept. | Yes. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.89 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support in part | Considers that while G58 is sound in principle, there may be instances where it is acceptable to have a car-park, subject to appropriate facade design located at upper levels extending to the street edge and this should be acknowledged - but the guideline and associated illustration preclude this. | Amend G58 (Grouped parking and shared access at grade) of the Residential Design Guide to allow for parking in some instances. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.90 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G59 addresses the same matter as G55 and the two guidelines should be combined, with the qualifying matter to G55 that a shared surface approach may be suitably safe and the optimal solution in some circumstances. | Seeks that G55 and G59 (Grouped parking and shared access at grade) of the Residential Design Guide are combined, with amendment to allow for a shared surface approach in some circumstances. | Accept. | Yes. |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|---------------|---|--|-------------------------|-----------------|
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.91 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers that G60 is both unspecific and broad, could mean many things. | Seeks that G60 (Grouped parking and shared access at grade) of the Residential Design Guide is edited or deleted. | Accept in part. | Yes. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.92 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers that G60 conflicts with G58. | Seeks that G60 (Grouped parking and shared access at grade) of the Residential Design Guide is edited or deleted. | Accept in part. | Yes. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.93 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers that the italicised statement above G62 relates to neighbourhood design yet the guideline relates to design within the site. | Seeks that the italicised statement above G62 (Legibility) of the Residential Design Guide is deleted as follows: Safety, accessibility and legibility contribute to vibrant connected neighbourhoods. | Accept. | Yes. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.94 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G62 should be integrated into 'Connections for People'. | Seeks that G62 (Legibility) of the Residential Design Guide is relocated to the section titled 'Connections for People'. | Accept. | Yes. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.95 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Not specified | Submission point re G63 to G72 (Lighting). Considers that lighting is a matter of detail that is generally covered later and can be referred to in conditions on a resource consent. | Not specified. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.96 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Submission point re G75 to G79 (Communal open space). Considers that these five guidelines could be compressed into one. | Seeks that G75 to G79 (Communal open space) of the Residential Design Guide are combined into one guideline. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.97 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Submission point re G75 to G79 (Communal open space). Considers that the more guidance is required on what an appropriate level and extent of sun should be for shared spaces. | Clarify the use of 'sunlight access' within G75 to G79 (Communal open space) of the Residential Design Guide. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.98 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G84 should include some provision for private occupation of parts of the frontage, with low fencing along the balance. | Seeks that G84 (Private open space) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to include some provision for private occupation of parts of the frontage, with low fencing along the balance. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.99 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the more guidance is required on what an appropriate level and extent of sun should be for private open spaces. | Clarify the use of 'sunlight access' within G84 (Private open space) of the Residential Design Guide. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.100 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G89 should refer to 'occupiable space', as clothes lines are a legitimate use that is required by the RDG. | Seeks that G89 (Balconies and sunrooms) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to refer to 'occupiable space'. | Accept. | Yes. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.101 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that there is much overlap and scope for considerable compression of G90-G92 (Waste collection) and G93 -G94 (Waste storage). Notes that these guidelines refer to the Council's Waste Collection Bylaw 2020 which might supersede much of this content. | Seeks that G90-G92 (Waste collection) and G93 -G94 (Waste storage) of the Residential Design Guide are compressed into less guidelines. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.102 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | No specific reason provided. | Seeks that G99, G101, G102 and G103 (External storage) of the Residential Design Guide are combined into a single guideline, | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.103 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | No specific reason provided. | Seeks that G104 and G105 (External storage) of the Residential Design Guide are combined into a single guideline, | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.104 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that guidance should be provided to address uncertainty created by G100. | Clarify G100 (External storage) of the Residential Design Guide. | Accept. | Yes. |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|-----------------------|-------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.105 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G105 may be challenging to achieve when storage and service areas are within basements and some service areas are on rooftops, and the text should be edited for more precision. | Seeks that the text of G105 (External storage) of the Residential Design Guide is edited for more precision. | Accept. | Yes. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.106 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Not specified | Considers that light (and heat) absorbent risk contributing to the urban heat island effect. Questions priorities - whether visibility of a building in an urban area is more important than minimising contribution to atmospheric heat gain. If the latter, the second bullet point of G107 should be removed. | Seeks that the second bullet point of G107 (Architectural context) of the Residential Design Guide is removed, depending on priorities. Use roof materials and colours that are dark and absorb rather than reflect light. | Accept. | Yes. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.107 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the wording of G110 should be turned around to provide for reasonable internal privacy. | Seeks that the wording of G110 (Visual privacy) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to provide for reasonable internal privacy. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.108 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Not specified | Considers that while G115 provides one way of dealing with noise, it is not strictly necessary and it would be preferable to identify that this might also be addressed by construction. | Amend G115 (Internal living spaces) of the Residential Design Guide. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.109 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G117 combines too many, not convincingly grouped matters. The guideline mixes room space standard with circulation layout and capacity, and room size is already covered by G114. And, for example, wayfinding does not apply to kitchens and bathrooms. | Amend G117 (Circulation) of the Residential Design Guide. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.110 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the title of G118 should be 'Sun Exposure' as the three guidelines refer to sun, and natural light is covered by G121 and G122 below this. | Amend title preceding G118-G120 (Light and sun) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Light and Sun Sun Exposure | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.111 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the use of 'direct natural lighting' needs to be defined or clarified. If this means exposure to the sky, this should be stated. | Clarify term 'direct natural lighting' at G118 (Light and Sun) of the Residential Design Guide. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.112 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G118 sits better under the 'Natural Lighting' heading. | Seeks that G118 (Light and Sun) of the Residential Design Guide is relocated under the heading 'Natural Light' below. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.113 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the use of the words 'maximum possible' at G119 leads to uncertainty and ambiguity, and that the minimum amount of sun that should be provided should be defined, allowing for some flexibility. | Amend G119 (Light and sun) of the Residential Design Guide to remove uncertainty. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.114 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that if there is no clear and unequivocal empirical link between borrowed light and mental wellbeing, then that part of the text should be removed. | Seeks that, if no link between borrowed light and mental wellbeing is shown, G122 (Natural light) of the Residential Design Guide is amended. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.115 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support in part | Considers that while G123 is sound in principle, this guideline which 'must be applied' may be problematic for apartments in noisy entertainment districts, and this situation must be recognised. | Amend G123 (Natural ventilation) of the Residential Design Guide. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.116 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | There needs to be guidance about what is meant by 'large' at G126. This mandatory requirement might be relevant to a large apartment development, but might be irrelevant to a large terraced housing development. | Clarify the use of the word 'large' at G126 (Community internal amenity) of the Residential Design Guide. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.117 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | There needs to be guidance about what is meant by 'are inclusive of' at G132 as this is a 'must be applied' guideline. | Clarify the use of 'are inclusive of' at G132 (Accessibility) of the Residential Design Guide. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.118 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Not specified | Considers that G133 might be an important aspect of achieving G132, but is given little weight (one dot). | Not specified. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.119 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers that G137 relating to City Outcomes Contributions should be deleted. | Seeks that G137 (City Outcomes Contribution) of the Residential Design Guide is deleted. | Addressed in Hearing Stream 4 | |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Jill Ford | 163.16 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | Supports the Residential Design Guide G99 as notified. | Retain G99 (For large developments, provide a secure weatherproof storage area external to the unit large enough to store a bicycle) in the Residential Design Guide as notified. | Accept. | No. |
| Jill Ford | 163.17 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | Supports the Residential Design Guide G100 as notified. | Retain G100 (External storage areas must be of an appropriate size and volume in relation to the occupancy of the allocated unit.) in the Residential Design Guide as notified. | Accept. | No. |
| Jill Ford | 163.18 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | Supports the Residential Design Guide G101 as notified. | Retain G101 (Where possible locate bicycle storage near to primary entrances for convenient access and to encourage usage) in the Residential Design Guide as notified. | Accept. | No. |
| Jill Ford | 163.19 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | Supports the Residential Design Guide G102 as notified. | Retain G102 (Bicycle storage should accommodate electric bicycles (wallmounted racks are inappropriate for electric bicycles). Bicycle storage should also consider including spaces for larger bicycles and adaptable bicycles) in the Residential Design Guide as notified. | Accept. | No. |
| Patrick Wilkes | 173.24 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support in part | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Retain Residential Design Guide guidance GG 99-102 (external bike storage) with amendment to include in objectives policies and rules. | Accept in part. | No. |
| Jaqui Tutt | 209.1 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | <p>Considers the importance of sunlight in Aro Valley.</p> <p>Considers the role of Aro Valley residents in writing appropriate sunlight rules.</p> <p>Supports the definition of sunlight as amenity attribute by Boffa Miskell and wider recommendations from Boffa Miskell.</p> <p>Considers that the Councillors recognise the importance of sunlight.</p> <p>Considers that it is unreasonable for Aro Valley Residents to have to leave their houses to access sunlight.</p> <p>Supports an amendment to include sunlight provisions in all residential zoned housing.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p> | <p>Seeks addition to Residential Design Guide to include the following:</p> <p>"Sun access to outdoor spaces between spring and autumn equinox (4hrs) as well as sun access to internal living spaces in winter (2hrs)".</p> | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.48 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the guideline (58) presents as a standard. | Seeks that guideline 58 (Grouped car-parking or shared access at grade) of the Residential Design Guide is removed or appropriately qualified. | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.49 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers that the guideline (58) presents as a standard. | Seeks that guideline 58 (Grouped car-parking or shared access at grade) of the Residential Design Guide is removed or appropriately qualified. | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.50 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the guideline (73) will be applied as a standard and is concerned with this. Considers that given the guideline applies to residential development, the provision of end of trip facilities would appear to be axiomatic, and the requirement can be deleted. | Seeks that guideline 73 (Carbon reduction - site) of the Residential Design Guide is appropriately qualified, for instance by amending the first sentence to "Encourage the provision of..." | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.51 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | The guideline (74) presents as a standard. | Seeks that guideline 74 (Carbon reduction - site) of the Residential Design Guide is appropriately qualified. | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.52 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that this outcome may not always be possible and a qualification along the lines of "wherever possible" should be added. The guideline (82) has the potential to have a significant impact on city centre housing stock particularly. | Seeks that guideline 82 (Private open space) of the Residential Design Guide is appropriately qualified. | Reject. | No. |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|----------|---|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.53 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers the matters listed in G93 present as standards and may be better achieved as a standard. | Seeks that guideline 93 (Waste collection) of the Residential Design Guide is removed. | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.54 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers the matter (94) presents as standards and may be better accommodated as such, if required. | Seeks that guideline 94 (Waste collection) of the Residential Design Guide is removed. | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.55 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that these guidelines (G99-G105) present as standards. As noted above, provision of bicycle storage for each apartment in a building can require significant space which comes at a cost, in turn affecting affordability. Not all users of an apartment building will require such storage. The practicality of G105 needs to be considered, particularly in an apartment context where access is controlled through security systems. | Seeks that guidelines G99-G105 (External storage) of the Residential Design Guide are appropriately qualified to not present as standards and are removed where possible. | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.56 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers that these guidelines (G99-G105) present as standards. As noted above, provision of bicycle storage for each apartment in a building can require significant space which comes at a cost, in turn affecting affordability. Not all users of an apartment building will require such storage. The practicality of G105 needs to be considered, particularly in an apartment context where access is controlled through security systems. | Seeks that guidelines G99-G105 (External storage) of the Residential Design Guide are appropriately qualified to not present as standards and are removed where possible. | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.57 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers that this guideline (120) presents as a standard in 'avoid' terms and would preclude any south facing apartment units which are often unavoidable in a city centre context. | Seeks to remove guideline 120 (Light and Sun) of the Residential Design Guide or appropriately qualify it, for example with "wherever possible". | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.58 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that this guideline (120) presents as a standard in 'avoid' terms and would preclude any south facing apartment units which are often unavoidable in a city centre context. | Seeks to remove guideline 120 (Light and Sun) of the Residential Design Guide or appropriately qualify it, for example with "wherever possible". | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.59 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers guideline (122) presents as a standard and requires something over and above building code requirements. This guideline is particularly problematic for city centre apartments. | Seeks to remove guideline 122 (Natural Light) of the Residential Design Guide or appropriately qualify it. | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.60 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers guideline (122) presents as a standard and requires something over and above building code requirements. This guideline is particularly problematic for city centre apartments. | Seeks to remove guideline 122 (Natural Light) of the Residential Design Guide or appropriately qualify it. | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.61 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers guideline (123) presents as a standard and requires something over and above building code requirements. This guideline is particularly problematic for city centre apartments. | Seeks to remove guideline 123 (Natural ventilation) of the Residential Design Guide or appropriately qualify it. | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.62 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers guideline (123) presents as a standard and requires something over and above building code requirements. This guideline is particularly problematic for city centre apartments. | Seeks to remove guideline 123 (Natural ventilation) of the Residential Design Guide or appropriately qualify it. | Reject. | No. |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.63 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers this (guideline 126) presents as a standard and would impose costs to multi-unit development. | Seeks to remove guideline 126 (Communal internal amenity) of the Residential Design Guide or appropriately qualify it. | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.64 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers this (guideline 126) presents as a standard and would impose costs to multi-unit development. | Seeks to remove guideline 126 (Communal internal amenity) of the Residential Design Guide or appropriately qualify it. | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.65 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers the guideline (129) presents as a standard and is unclear on whether the requirement is for each and every residential unit. | Remove guideline 129 (Communal internal amenity) of the Residential Design Guide. | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.66 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers the guideline (130) presents as a standard and is inherently subjective. | Seeks to remove guideline 130 (Internal Storage) of the Residential Design Guide or greater qualification. | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.67 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers the guideline (130) presents as a standard and is inherently subjective. | Seeks to remove guideline 130 (Internal Storage) of the Residential Design Guide or greater qualification. | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.68 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers the guideline (131) presents as a standard and is inherently subjective. | Seeks to remove guideline 131 (Internal Storage) of the Residential Design Guide or greater qualification. | Reject. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.69 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers the guideline (131) presents as a standard and is inherently subjective. | Seeks to remove guideline 131 (Internal Storage) of the Residential Design Guide or greater qualification. | Reject. | No. |
| McDonald's | 274.78 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | 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. | Seeks that G137 of the Residential Design Guide (City Outcomes Contributions) is deleted. | Addressed in Hearing Stream 4 | |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|---|-------------------|---|----------|---|---|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Johnsonville Community Association Inc | FS114.46 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | Considers that while large scale residential developments “will positively contribute to addressing future challenges confronting the city”, such developments will also likely have a severe adverse impact on the neighbouring properties. Having a 6 storey development under NDRZ zone rules occur next door will have a major impact on neighbouring home owners and having a 7, 8 or higher development under City Outcome Rules will only have a greater adverse local impact. It is particularly objectionable that a development can increase its height by simply “satisfying the relevant design guide”. It is unclear what would enable a development to meet this criteria but the design guide does not include any significantly onerous requirements ... in fact “The guidance that follows here is ... to ensure best practice design approaches and encourage built outcomes.” This one provision essentially increases the maximum height in these zones by 1 storey to 7 storeys for MDRZ and 2 storeys to 10 storeys in the Metropolitan. The JCA supports the encouragement of significant residential developments but it is unfair to support this by rewarding such developments with height increases beyond PDP maximums. This permits developments that can be out of scale to the area in which it is built with major local adverse impacts on amenity and property values. | Allow / Seeks to delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in its entirety. | Addressed in Hearing Stream 4 | |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.183 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | The RVA supports part of the relief sought in this submission as it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission, however, The RVA would seek for the deletion of the Design Guides in full. | Allow | Addressed in Hearing Stream 4 | |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.184 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | The RVA supports part of the relief sought in this submission as it is consistent with RVA's primary submission, however, The RVA would seek for the deletion of the Design Guides in full. | Allow | Addressed in Hearing Stream 4 | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.183 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | Ryman supports part of the relief sought in this submission as it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission, however, Ryman would seek for the deletion of the Design Guides in full. | Allow | Addressed in Hearing Stream 4 | |
| Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Biddy Bunzl, Margaret Franken, Michelle Wolland, and Lee Muir | 275.50 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer back to original submission] | Retain the Residential design guide as notified | Accept. | No. |
| Phillippa O'Connor | 289.39 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers that the Design Guides should be removed as part of the statutory framework of the plan in respect of restricted discretionary activities as these are subjective and do not allow the rule framework to set clear parameters. | Seeks that the design guides are not a statutory requirement in respect of restricted discretionary activities. [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |
| Phillippa O'Connor | 289.40 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Considers that the Design Guides should be removed as part of the statutory framework of the plan in respect of restricted discretionary activities as these are subjective and do not allow the rule framework to set clear parameters. | Seeks that the guidelines in the design guides are included within the zone-based rules as standards or matters of discretion. [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |
| Tapu-te-Ranga Trust | 297.35 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | Supports the reference to whakapapa of place, given their land is a site of significance and will support traditional uses. | Retain G2 (Responding to whakapapa of place) of the Residential Design Guide as notified. | Accept. | No. |
| Wellington Branch NZIA | 301.16 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the Residential Design Guides should be split into three parts and be redesigned to adequately reflect that there are now distinctly different zones for Residential within the revised District Plan. These three distinct zones are low-end MDRZ, high-end CCZ and all the other zones clustered in between. [Refer to original submission for full reason] | Seeks that the Residential Design Guide be split into three parts: low-end Medium Density Residential, high-end City Centre Zone and all zones in between. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.228 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.228 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Wellington Branch NZIA | 301.17 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the Residential Design Guide requires clarification. The thorough guidance provided by the now former Multi-Unit Design Guide has now been replaced by vague-sounding statements. | Clarify the Residential Design Guide to be less vague. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.229 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|---|-------------------|---|----------------|--|---|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.229 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Wellington Branch NZIA | 301.18 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G109 in the Residential Design Guide has vague statements. [Refer to original submission for full reason] | Clarify G109 in Residential Design Guide to provide more guidance on Medium Density housing and High Density Housing needs. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.230 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.230 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Wellington Branch NZIA | 301.19 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose in part | Considers that the City Outcomes Contributions will not maintain the concept of High City / Low City form in the Operative District Plan. [Refer to original submission for full reason] | Opposes G137 (City outcomes Contributions) of the Residential Design Guide. | Addressed in Hearing Stream 4 | |
| Wellington Branch NZIA | 301.20 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the Facades section of the Residential Design Guide (G41) is too short and inadequate and should be amended to be more thorough. The section should include provisions on proportion, materials, texture and colour. | Amend the G41 (Facades) of the Residential Design Guide to include provisions on proportion, materials, texture and colour. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.231 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.231 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Wellington Branch NZIA | 301.21 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the Facades section of the Residential Design Guide (G41) should require multi-storey buildings to be designed by Registered Architects, such as the NZIA. | Amend G41 (Facades) of the Residential Design Guide to require multi-storey buildings to be designed by Registered Architects. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.232 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.232 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Wellington Branch NZIA | 301.22 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G87 (Balconies and Sunrooms) should mandate the provision of a balcony or deck to every living space in the CCZ, even where something as small as a student housing unit is proposed. The Residential Design Guide states: "Good quality balcony spaces or sunrooms can substantially improve residents' quality of life and increase the value and desirability of apartments to potential buyers". Therefore, these should be mandatory. The events of the last few years with the Covid pandemic showed the world the vital importance of access to external open space. While people in the MDRZ can access a front or rear yard, people living in the CCZ must have access to a balcony space. | Amend G87 (Balconies and sunrooms) of the Residential Design Guide to mandate a balcony or deck to every living space in the City Centre Zones. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.233 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|---|-------------------|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.233 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Wellington Branch NZIA | 301.23 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the star rating of importance in Private Open Space and Communal Open Space should be amended to give more importance to multi-unit housing rather than single houses. Single houses under Private Open Space G80 to G84 have a three-star rank, implying they are of highest importance than multi-housing under Communal Open Space in G75 to G79. | Seeks that G75 to G79 (Communal Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide be classified as being of three-star importance. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.234 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.234 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Wellington Branch NZIA | 301.24 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that items G63 to G72 under the Light section are only concerned with artificial electric light, and do not refer to natural levels of daylight and sunlight. The Lighting section of the Residential Design Guide should be re-titled as "Artificial Light". | Amend the heading of the 'Lighting' section in the Residential Design Guide to rename it to "Artificial Light". | Accept. | Yes. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.235 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Reject. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.235 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Reject. | |
| Wellington Branch NZIA | 301.25 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the Lighting section of the Residential Design Guide should be moved next to sections on Light and Sun (G18 to G120), and Natural Light (G121 & G122). | Amend the Residential Design Guide to put the 'Lighting' section near the 'Light and Sun' and 'Natural Light' sections. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.236 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.236 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Wellington Branch NZIA | 301.26 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the Natural Ventilation section of the Residential Design Guide should require opening windows on two separate facades. G123 states: "Ensure habitable rooms, especially bedrooms and living spaces have at least one openable window to an external wall for direct access to fresh air". Research has shown a greatly increased ability for natural ventilation to actually work when there are opening windows on two separate facades, which allows far better pull through of natural ventilation. | Amend G123 (Natural ventilation) of the Residential Design Guide to require opening windows on two separate facades. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.237 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.237 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| James Coyle | 307.28 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the word 'daylight' is too vague and should be replaced with 'sunlight' as sunlight is direct and can be measured. Daylight can be indirect and is not specific enough to be measured sufficiently. | Seeks that the term 'daylight' be changed to 'sunlight' in the Residential Design Guide. [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|--|-------------------|--|----------|---|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| James Coyle | 307.29 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | The term "daylight" should be amended to "sunlight" in the Residential Design Guide. Buildings should look to solar gain for regulating temperature and need direct sunlight for this. The carbon footprint of buildings need to be reduced and air conditioning usage should be decreased. Natural techniques for ventilation and temperature regulation should be used. Direct sun in Winter should be maximised. | Amend language in the Residential Design Guide to replace "daylight" with "sunlight". | Reject. | No. |
| Bruce Crothers | 319.19 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | Supports G99 to G102 (external bike storage) and considers that these should be carried into the PDP rules, policies and objectives. | Retain G99 to G102 (external bike storage) of the Residential Design Guide as notified. | Accept. | No. |
| Joan Fitzgerald | 323.5 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | Supports GG99 to G102 (external bike storage). | Retain G99-102 (External bike storage) of the Residential Design Guide as notified. | Accept. | No. |
| Bruce Rae | 334.6 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the proper use of Appendices should be clarified. The residential design guide flowchart makes it clear the appendices must be used in conjunction with the main design guide. However, in the 'unqualified' parts of the MRZ the main design guide is only engaged when four or more units are intended for a site. In character areas, an alteration affecting neither floor area nor function of rooms, triggers a requirement to follow both the main residential design guide as well as the character precincts appendix, which seems excessive. Additional scope guidance is needed at the start of the appendices, making it clear that the assessment does not need to expand to the whole of the building on the whole of the site when only limited works on a limited part of the site are contemplated. Clarification of whether a full and expensive assessment or a more streamlined assessment is needed will suffice. | Seeks that the Residential Design Guide Appendices be amended to have an additional scope guidance at the start of appendices, so as to clarify the scope of required assessments. | Reject. | No. |
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.15 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that inserting the term 'must' rather than 'should' in clause G37 of the Residential Design Guide provides greater emphasis on the need to meet standards. | Submitter has incorrectly referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide. [Inferred Decision Sought] Amend G37 (Entrances) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Entrances should <u>must</u> be of adequate dimensions to provide universal access for all and allow for movement from a wide range of users, including moving furniture and wheelchairs. | Reject. | No. |
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.16 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the use of "where possible" in clause G39 of the Residential Design Guide is not appropriate and does not emphasise the need for greater compliance and uptake from designers, developers and builders. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.] | Amend G39 (Entrances) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: <u>Where possible</u> , ensure dwellings on the ground floor have a step-free entry. [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.17 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that inserting the term 'must' rather than 'should' in clause G53 of the Residential Design Guide provides greater emphasis on the need to meet standards. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.] | Amend G53 (Garages, carports and carparks) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Developments designed for limited mobility users should <u>must</u> provide an accessible link between parking spaces and their associated unit. [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.18 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the use of 'where possible' in clause G116 of the Residential Design Guide is not appropriate and does not emphasise the need for greater compliance and uptake from designers, developers and builders. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.] | Seeks to amend G116 (Internal living spaces) as follows: <u>Where possible</u> , ensure ground level dwellings and all habitable rooms are designed for accessible and practical use. [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.19 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | Supports clause G117 of the Residential Design Guide as this provision will ensure uptake and compliance from designers, builders and developers. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.] | Retain G117 (Circulation) of the Residential Design Guide as notified. [Inferred decision requested] | Accept. | No. |
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.20 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that inserting the word 'impairments' rather than 'abilities' in clause G132 of the Residential Design Guide is more appropriate. Notes that using the term 'abilities' to refer to disabled people is regarded as euphemistic by many within the disabled community. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.] | Amend G132 (Accessibility) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Ensure developments are inclusive of people of all ages and abilities <u>impairments</u> , including the ageing population, children and pregnant women or parents with infants and toddlers. [Inferred decision requested] | Accept. | Yes. |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|--|-------------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.21 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that inserting 'ensure' rather than 'where possible, provide' in clause G133 of the Residential Design Guide provides greater compliance and uptake by designers, builders and developers. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.] | Amend G133 (Accessibility) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Where possible, provide Ensure ground-level access that is accessible by people using wheelchairs, and design units with reference to NZ standards for access and mobility [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.22 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that inserting the term 'must' rather than 'should' in clause G37 of the Residential Design Guide provides greater emphasis on the need to meet standards. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.] | Amend G37 (Entrances) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Entrances should must be of adequate dimensions to provide universal access for all and allow for movement from a wide range of users, including moving furniture and wheelchairs. [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.23 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the use of "where possible" in clause G39 of the Residential Design Guide is not appropriate and does not emphasise the need for greater compliance and uptake from designers, developers and builders. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.] | Amend G39 (Entrances) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Where possible, ensure dwellings on the ground floor have a step-free entry. [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.24 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that replacing "limited mobility users" with "people with mobility impairments, i.e., wheelchair users, mobility aid users, etc" is more appropriate as the intention is to refer to this grouping of the disability community. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.] | Amend G53 (Garages, carports and carpads) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Developments designed for limited mobility users <u>people with mobility impairments, i.e., wheelchair users, mobility aid users, etc</u> , should provide an accessible link between parking spaces and their associated unit. [Inferred decision requested] | Accept. | Yes. |
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.25 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Seeks to add "Changes in the level should be properly ramped" as an additional sentence to point 7 of clause G76 of the Residential Design Guide. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.] | Amend G76 (Communal open space) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Communal open space should: » Offer a sense of manaakitanga (are safe and inviting). » Be the focus of the development.» Be of an appropriate proportion and defined by the built form. » Have a direct or easy connection to all dwellings. » Be located and oriented to receive sun and shelter at times of highest use. » Be flat, but may incorporate changes in level where these are designed to add to the visual and functional amenity of the space. <u>Changes in level should be properly ramped.</u> » Include landscape elements that are of an appropriate scale e.g trees, seating and fences. [Inferred decision requested] | Accept. | Yes. |
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.26 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that inserting the term 'accessible' will ensure spaces can be accessible for all people, including disabled people and that reference should be made to kitchenettes in clause 78 of the Residential Design Guide. | Amend G78 (Communal open space) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Where possible, provide <u>accessible</u> communal spaces for social interaction and outdoor activities, <u>including kitchenettes</u> . Especially in more significant developments or where private outdoor living spaces are insufficient for people to meet their everyday needs. [Inferred Decision Sought] | Accept in part. | Yes. |
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.27 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that inserting the term 'accessible' before "open space" would indicate that sometimes balconies are inaccessible to disabled people, particularly wheelchair or mobility aid users due to the fact that too often balconies are too small to accommodate wheelchairs or mobility aids and lips can be difficult to negotiate. | Amend G81 (Private open space) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Assign private <u>accessible</u> open space to individual units of a type and quality appropriate to the dwelling typology, wherever possible. [Inferred decision requested] | Accept. | Yes. |
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.28 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | Support clause G86 of the Residential Design Guide on the basis that the concept of accessibility will be understood by guide users. | Retain G86 (Private open space) of the Residential Design Guide as notified. [Inferred decision requested] | Accept. | No. |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|---|-------------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.29 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | Support clause G91 of the Residential Design Guide on the basis that the concept of accessibility as it applies to the needs of disabled householders is understood. | Retain G91 (Waste storage) of the Residential Design Guide as notified. [Inferred decision requested] | Accept. | No. |
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.30 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that guidance on large scale plant fixtures in clauses G96 - G98 need to ensure they are placed at accessible heights or in such a way that they can be easily adjusted by the householder concerned, and this includes by disabled people. | Amend G96, G97 and G98 (Service elements) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: G96. • • <u>Any and all large plant fixtures should be placed at accessible heights where they can be easily adjusted by the householder concerned, including by any disabled person.</u> Suitable space for natural or open-air laundry drying should be provided, within or accessible from each dwelling, but not within the defined 'principal area' or within shared open spaces that might be used for gathering. G97. • • <u>Any and all large plant fixtures should be placed at accessible heights where they can be easily adjusted by the householder concerned, including by any disabled person.</u> Smaller-scale external service elements such as air conditioning units, water heating units, gas bottles and water tanks, should not be visible from the public realm, dominate entrances or be located in the principal area of private open space or within shared open gathering spaces. G98. • <u>Any and all large plant fixtures should be placed at accessible heights where they can be easily adjusted by the householder concerned, including by any disabled person.</u> Where possible, integrate any necessary security features into buildings or public spaces by designing them intrinsic, unobtrusive, or positive decorative features. [Inferred decision requested] | Accept in part. | Yes. |
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.31 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | Support clause G106 of the Residential Design Guide as the provisions comply with updated architectural practises. | Retain G106 (Architectural context) of the Residential Design Guide as notified. [Inferred decision requested] | Accept. | No. |
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.32 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the use of 'where possible' in clause G116 of the Residential Design Guide is not appropriate and does not emphasise the need for greater compliance and uptake from designers, developers and builders. | Seeks to amend G116 (Internal living spaces) as follows: <u>Where possible</u> , ensure ground level dwellings and all habitable rooms are designed for accessible and practical use. [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.33 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that replacing the term 'abilities' with 'impairments' in clause G132 of the Residential Design Guide is more appropriate. Notes that using the term 'abilities' to refer to disabled people is regarded as euphemistic by many within the disabled community. Considers that the other examples of impairment-based groups should be also identified in the last sentence of same clause. | Amend G132 (Accessibility) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: Ensure developments are inclusive of people of all ages and <u>abilities impairments</u> , including the ageing population, children and pregnant women or parents with infants and toddlers, <u>and people who use mobility aids such as wheelchairs and crutches.</u> [Inferred decision requested] | Accept. | Yes |
| Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated | 343.34 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the use of "where possible" in clause G133 of the Residential Design Guide is not appropriate and does not emphasise the need for greater compliance and uptake from designers, developers and builders. | Amend G133 (Accessibility) of the Residential Design Guide as follows: <u>Where possible</u> , provide ground-level access that is accessible by people using wheelchairs, and design units with reference to NZ standards for access and mobility. [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |
| Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | 350.306 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | 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. | Reject. | No. |
| Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs | 369.18 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | Considers that it is pleasing to note the mention of embodied energy in the Design Guidelines: Existing buildings contain embodied energy, and their retention avoids the additional use of carbon associated with the construction of new buildings, including in materials, transport, demolition and landfill. Retaining existing buildings in a sustainable long-term use, whether through the retention of its original use or by the adaptation for a new use, can be a sustainable option. These are all important matters that need to be given due consideration and weighted in considering any new development. | Retain the Residential Design Guide as notified, especially the mention of embodied energy. [Inferred decision requested] | Accept. | No. |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--|----------|---|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs | 369.19 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | Considers that direct sunlight to a home is an integral part of creating and maintaining a healthy home and supporting residents' wellbeing. The Design Guidelines recognise the benefit of solar access to improve energy efficiency and wellbeing. | Retain Residential Design Guide as notified, especially provisions relating to the benefits of sunlight access. [Inferred decision requested] | Accept. | No. |
| Glenside Progressive Association Inc | 374.12 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the Residential Design Guide's section on Built Form should be strengthened to include form, colour and light pollution for housing that is visually prominent, where houses are visually prominent, attention needs to be paid by the architect and builder to the form, shape and colour of the building. This is especially important for houses in high altitude locations or houses which are visible from a distance. It is suggested that the Residential Design Guide refers to the preferred use of forms that harmonise with the landscape where concentrated housing developments are located high on hillsides or close to ridgelines. This includes the use of natural materials, and colour schemes selected from a palette of subdued natural colours that vary from building to building where possible. | Amend the Residential Design guide to more strictly regulate visually prominent form and colours. | Reject. | No. |
| Glenside Progressive Association Inc | 374.13 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the Residential Design Guide's section on Light should be amended to more strongly minimise long-distance and cross-valley light pollution. Light pollution is of special concern when the light arises from new, visually prominent housing developments. Light pollution from a new housing development in Glenside West will adversely affect the Glenside Valley unless measures are taken to ensure that outside lighting including street lighting is diverted downwards and shielded. | Amend the Residential Design guide to more strictly regulate light pollution. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.13 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that there is now the low-end MDRZ, the high-end CCZ, and all the other Zones clustered in between. The guidelines for what to do in the high density CCZ need to offer markedly different advice from the much lower density MDRZ. The MDRZ in particular is still likely to comprise single family houses for many years to come, and even the new housing in this zone is likely to be mainly just one or two storey high, even if denser than before. | Seeks that the Residential Design Guides are split into three parts redesigned to adequately reflect the different residential zones in the Proposed District Plan. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.15 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the former daylight access planes almost guaranteed sunlight and daylight for any house in what was the Inner and Outer Residential Zones. The revised recession planes imposed by the new MDRS and the adoption of the MDRZ removes the chance for sunlight, while also reducing the chance of adequate daylight. | Seeks the addition to the Residential Design Guide on how to manage sunlight considerations. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.16 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that guidance on Medium Density and High Density Housing needs to be so much more, or we will end up with continued urban housing disasters. | Seeks that guidance on the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) is expanded. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.17 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that guidance on Medium Density and High Density Housing needs to be so much more, or we will end up with continued urban housing disasters. | Seeks that guidance on the HRZ (High Density Residential Zone) is expanded. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.18 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the events of the last few years with the Covid pandemic showed the world the vital importance of access to external open space. While people in the MDRZ can access a front or rear yard, people living in the CCZ must have access to a balcony space. | Seeks that G87 (Balconies and sunrooms) of the Residential Design Guide mandates the provision of a balcony or deck to every living space in the City Centre Zone. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.19 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G80 - G84 of the Residential Design Guide are important and should apply to multi-unit housing. | Seeks that G80 (Private Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide applies to multi-unit housing. [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.20 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G80 - G84 of the Residential Design Guide are important and should apply to multi-unit housing. | Seeks that G81 (Private Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide applies to multi-unit housing. [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.21 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G80 - G84 of the Residential Design Guide are important and should apply to multi-unit housing. | Seeks that G82 (Private Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide applies to multi-unit housing. [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.22 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G80 - G84 of the Residential Design Guide are important and should apply to multi-unit housing. | Seeks that G83 (Private Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide applies to multi-unit housing. [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|----------------|-------------------|--|----------|--|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Guy Marriage | 407.23 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G80 - G84 of the Residential Design Guide are important and should apply to multi-unit housing. | Seeks that G84 (Private Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide applies to multi-unit housing. [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.24 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G75 - G79 of the Residential Design Guide should be given more importance, especially with medium density housing. | Seeks that G75 (Communal Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide should be amended to be given three star (***) importance. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.25 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G75 - G79 of the Residential Design Guide should be given more importance, especially with medium density housing. | Seeks that G76 in the Residential Style Guide should be amended to be given more importance. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.26 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G75 - G79 of the Residential Design Guide should be given more importance, especially with medium density housing. | Seeks that G77 (Communal Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide should be amended to be given three star (***) importance. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.27 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G75 - G79 of the Residential Design Guide should be given more importance, especially with medium density housing. | Seeks that G78 (Communal Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide should be amended to be given three star (***) importance. | Accept in part. | Yes. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.28 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G75 - G79 of the Residential Design Guide should be given more importance, especially with medium density housing. | Seeks that G79 (Communal Open Space) in the Residential Design Guide should be amended to be given three star (***) importance. | Accept in part. | Yes. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.29 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Seeks that G63 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.30 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Seeks that G64 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.31 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Seeks that G65 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.32 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Seeks that G66 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.33 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Seeks that G67 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.34 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Seeks that G68 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.35 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Seeks that G69 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.36 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Seeks that G70 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.37 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Seeks that G71 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.38 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Concerned that G63 - G72 of the Residential Design Guide only applies to artificial light and not natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Seeks that G72 (Lighting) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to apply to natural levels of daylight and sunlight. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.39 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission] | Amend the Residential Design Guide to put the "Lighting" provisions (G62 - G72) next to the "Light and sunlight" provisions (G118 to G120). | Reject. | No. |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|---|-------------------|---|----------------|--|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Guy Marriage | 407.40 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission] | Amend the Residential Design Guide to put the "Lighting" provisions (G62 - G72) next to the "Artificial Light" provisions (G121 to G122). | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.41 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that research has shown a greatly increased ability for natural ventilation to actually work when there are opening windows on two separate facades, which allows for better pull through of natural ventilation. | Seeks that G123 (Natural Ventilation) of the Residential Design Guide is amended to mandate the provision of windows on two different facades. [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.42 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G41 is short and inadequate. The external appearance of buildings makes up the physical appearance of the capital city, | Seeks that G41 (Facades) of the Residential Design Guide is expanded, requiring multi-storey buildings to be designed by Registered Architects. | Reject. | No. |
| Guy Marriage | 407.43 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G41 is short and inadequate. The external appearance of buildings makes up the physical appearance of the capital city, | Seeks that G41 (Facades) of the Residential Design Guide includes a provision for statements on proportion, materials, texture and colour. | Reject. | No. |
| Wellington Heritage Professionals | 412.85 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the guidance G31 of the residential design guide should include a diagram to show how to manage height and scale adjacent to a heritage place. | Amend the design guide to include G3.5 and the associated diagrams from the current Central Area Urban Design Guide | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.249 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.249 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Metlifecare Limited | 413.43 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose in part | Design guide does not provide guidelines relating to retirement village development and should not be applied to this type of development. Any design guide should also not sit within the plan as a standard but sit outside the plan as a guidance tool only. | Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points. | Reject. | No. |
| Metlifecare Limited | 413.44 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Design guide does not provide guidelines relating to retirement village development and should not be applied to this type of development. Any design guide should also not sit within the plan as a standard but sit outside the plan as a guidance tool only. | Seeks to amend the Residential Design Guide to make it clear that it does not apply to retirement village development. | Reject. | No. |
| Metlifecare Limited | 413.45 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Design guide does not provide guidelines relating to retirement village development and should not be applied to this type of development. Any design guide should also not sit within the plan as a standard but sit outside the plan as a guidance tool only. | Seeks to provide for the Residential Design Guide as a guidance tool only that sits outside of the District Plan. | Reject. | No. |
| VictLabour | 414.59 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | Supports the suggestion that on-site car parks may not be required for new developments. | Retain G56 of the residential design guide. [Inferred decision requested] | Accept. | No. |
| Willis Bond and Company Limited | 416.210 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that generally, a more permissive approach to multi-unit housing should be taken within the Medium Density Residential Zone provided the relevant height limits and building envelope controls are complied with. The Residential Design Guide should be non-statutory. [Refer to submission points made on 'Design Guides' and HRZ – P6]. | Seeks that the Residential Design Guide be made non-statutory. [Inferred decision]. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.272 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Not specified | The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission. | Reject. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.272 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Not specified | Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission. | Reject. | |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|--|-------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Johnsonville Community Association | 429.42 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that large-scale developments will likely have adverse impacts on neighbouring properties. It is unclear what would enable a development to meet the criteria of "satisfying the relevant design guide". Considers that it is unfair to encourage developments by rewarding height increases beyond PDP maximums. [See original submission for full reason] | Delete the City Outcomes Contribution provisions from Residential Design Guide in its entirety. | Addressed in Hearing Stream 4 | |
| Ingrid Downey | 443.2 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the existing provisions relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan should be retained rather than replacing them with the minimum daylight provisions in the PDP. Keeping the Operative Plan provisions will ensure a minimum level of quality - and humanity - will be maintained in our new homes. Considers that light is fundamental to our well-being, and shading is far more than simply a minor issue. Reductions in sunlight can and do affect: heating and light cost; dampness; the ability to dry clothes outside and grow food; and mental well-being. | Seeks that the existing provisions relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan are reinstated in the Design Guides. [Inferred decision requested]. | Reject. | No |
| Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's | 459.17 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that good design will take these trees into account and provide a better outcome for residents. | Seeks amendment that Residential Design Guide G19 (regenerate waterways and enhance the stream ecology where waterways exist above or below ground) is mandatory. [Inferred decision requested]. | Reject. | No |
| Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's | 459.18 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that good design will take these trees into account and provide a better outcome for residents. | Seeks amendment that Residential Design Guide G20 (protect and enhance existing native bush and significant trees on-site and in the surrounding area) is mandatory. [Inferred decision requested]. | Accept in part. | Yes. |
| Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's | 459.19 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Not specified | Considers that G24 partially supports a 1.5m-2m minimum setback for the planting of a street scape i.e. trees | Not specified. | Reject. | No. |
| Anita Gude and Simon Terry | 461.33 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Developers should be required to conform to "Guiding principles" specified in the design guide. As worded, the policies present more of an advisory note than a mandatory requirement. All developers should be required to conform to the "Guiding principles". | Include a requirement in the "Guiding Principles" in the Residential (Character Precincts) Design Guide (page 5-9) that "Applicants must demonstrate that the provisions of this Design Guide have been acknowledged and interpreted and their objectives satisfied". Noted that this may require a change to MRZ-PREC01-01 (Purpose). | Reject. | No. |
| Foodstuffs North Island | 476.62 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose in part | Opposes the City Outcomes Contribution and seeks that it be removed from the plan in its entirety. | Delete the City Outcomes Contribution (G137) from the Residential Design Guide. | Addressed in Hearing Stream 4 | |
| Catharine Underwood | 481.33 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that the design guides should require all new development to have solar or wind for communal lighting and heating, rather than incentivising or negotiating it. Making these a requirement would be a great move to sustainability. | Amend the Residential Design Guide to require solar or wind for communal lighting and heating. | Reject. | No. |
| Catharine Underwood | 481.34 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support in part | Supports the planting of more native trees as per G5 and G6. It is expected that hope the range of specimen trees mentioned in G10 are predominately native trees, as they provide a better habitat for native species, contribute to the street scape as well as off setting emissions. | Retain Vegetation and Planting recommendations in the Residential Design Guide (G5, G6 and G10) as notified. [Inferred decision requested] | Accept. | No. |
| Catharine Underwood | 481.35 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support in part | Considers that it is unclear and uncertain whether the Residential Design Guide guidelines with actually provide protection for trees and require designs to be made around them. There is concern regarding developers getting permission to raze and cut down trees. | Amend the Residential Design Guide to clarify that trees will actively be protected from development. [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |
| Catharine Underwood | 481.36 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that water conservation (G17 and G18) should be made mandatory, as it will be very costly, if not impossible, to include water retrofittings in buildings after they have been built. New Zealand should take note of what Japan is doing. | Seeks that Water Conservation recommendations in the Residential Design Guide (G17 and G18) be made mandatory. | Reject. | No. |
| Catharine Underwood | 481.37 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G19 and G20 (Ecology) in the Residential Design Guide should be made mandatory. Good design will take trees into account and provide a better outcome for residents, instead of cutting down trees to get more money from extra apartments. G24 also supports prior amendment suggestions of 1.5m minimum setback for the planting of a street scape. | Seeks that Ecology recommendations in the Residential Design Guide (G19 and G20) be made mandatory. | Reject. | No. |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|---|-----------------|---|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Catharine Underwood | 481.38 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Considers that G60 in the Residential Design Guide is unclear, as it refers to grouping carparks to improve setbacks, despite it being understood that there would be not setbacks to the front or sides. | Clarify the intent of G60 of the Residential Design Guide [Inferred decision requested] | Accept. | Yes. |
| Catharine Underwood | 481.39 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Not specified | Considers that sub-points in the Residential Design Guide regarding cars and carparking tend to have 'must' in their wording, while sub-points on storage for ebikes, bikes, scooters and other modes of transport have 'should' in their wording, such as G74 under the heading Carbon Reduction. | Not specified. | Reject. | No. |
| Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira | 488.97 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support in part | Supports the Residential Design Guide as it provides direction on matters such as urban design, stormwater and implementation of climate change measures that are part of PDP's pivotal strategic objectives. | Retain the residential design guide as notified. | Accept. | No. |
| Dinah Priestley | 495.3 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Oppose | Opposes the provisions of the MRZ and associated design guides relating to residential development within the residential suburbs of the city. Considers that Council's proposals are aimed specifically at achieving a complete transformation of the inner residential neighbourhoods through intensification that will result in the irrevocable loss of the city's older housing stock which gives Wellington its special character and unique sense of place. It is believed that the inner residential neighbourhoods can make an acceptable contribution to city growth without destroying the existing residential fabric. | Seeks that the Residential Design Guide is re-written to achieve reasonable intensification whilst maintaining and enhancing the existing valued housing stock. The Guide will need to recognize both residential character and heritage qualities ensure appropriate implementation. | Reject. | No. |
| Thorndon Residents' Association Inc | F569.64 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | The TRA believes that the city can have its cake and eat it. That it is not necessary to plan and zone for irrevocable loss of the city's valued older housing stock. And especially when this is part of Wellington special character and unique sense of place. It is observed how liveable cities overseas are enhanced by appreciating these values, and undertaking urban planning accordingly to get the right balance. Inner residential neighbourhoods like Thorndon have made an acceptable contribution to city growth, and can continue to do so without destroying the existing residential fabric. | Allow | Reject. | |
| Dinah Priestley | 495.4 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Amend | Opposes the provisions of the MRZ and associated design guides relating to residential development within the residential suburbs of the city. Considers that Council's proposals are aimed specifically at achieving a complete transformation of the inner residential neighbourhoods through intensification that will result in the irrevocable loss of the city's older housing stock which gives Wellington its special character and unique sense of place. It is believed that the inner residential neighbourhoods can make an acceptable contribution to city growth without destroying the existing residential fabric. | Seeks that the Residential Design Guide is re-written to achieve reasonable intensification whilst maintaining and enhancing the existing valued housing stock. The Guide will need to recognize both residential character and heritage qualities ensure appropriate implementation. | Reject. | No. |
| Thorndon Residents' Association Inc | F569.65 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Residential Design Guide | Support | The TRA believes that the city can have its cake and eat it. That it is not necessary to plan and zone for irrevocable loss of the city's valued older housing stock. And especially when this is part of Wellington special character and unique sense of place. It is observed how liveable cities overseas are enhanced by appreciating these values, and undertaking urban planning accordingly to get the right balance. Inner residential neighbourhoods like Thorndon have made an acceptable contribution to city growth, and can continue to do so without destroying the existing residential fabric. | Allow | Reject. | |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|---|-------------------|---|---------------|---|--|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Wellington City Youth Council | 201.43 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Considers the importance of high quality, high density residential development and urban form, ensuring that people have access to green spaces, light, warmth, and air. Considers that high quality, sustainable materials should be a focus for buildings and infrastructure that stands the test of time. Considers that ensuring spaces are clean, welcoming and have an attractive aesthetic are also immensely important to contribute to wellbeing for everyone in the city. | Not specified. | Accept. | No. |
| Willis Bond and Company Limited | 416.199 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | The proposed development areas of Upper Stebbings Valley and Glenside West represent logical and planned extensions to the existing urban areas that they adjoin. Infrastructure can be extended to serve these areas including roading, water and drainage as well as power and fibre that has been reticulated to the boundary of these areas. These new areas are important to accommodate the growing needs of the City and can be well served by public transport (including the #1 Bus). As with all greenfield areas in Wellington, some earthworks are required to provide access roads and building areas and this is the reality of developing land in Wellington. It has also been necessary to review how much of the ridgelines can be protected to accommodate this growth. | Include HRZ-S16 (Maximum building depth for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) in a non-statutory Design Guide. | Reject. | No. |
| Willis Bond and Company Limited | 416.205 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide | Amend | Submitter considers that the building separation distance is too restrictive and they do not consider it meets the RMA tests for appropriateness. | Include HRZ-S17 (Minimum building separation distance for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) in a non-statutory Design Guide. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.267 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide | Not specified | The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission. | Reject. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.267 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide | Not specified | Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission. | Reject. | |
| Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | 350.67 | Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | 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. | Reject. | No. |
| Greater Wellington Regional Council | 351.11 | Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | 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, "Fulfills 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. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.53 | General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | Oppose | The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.53 | General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | Oppose | Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Investore Property Limited | 405.5 | Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | 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. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.75 | General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | 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. | Reject. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.75 | General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | 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. | Reject. | |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|---|---|---|---------------|---|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Willis Bond and Company Limited | 416.6 | Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | 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. - 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). | 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. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.252 | General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | Not specified | The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission. | Reject. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.252 | General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | Not specified | Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission. | Reject. | |
| Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's | 459.3 | Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | Not specified | Considers that there should be mandatory design requirements. [Refer to original submission for full reason] | Add mandatory design requirements. [inferred decision requested]. | Reject. | No. |
| Foodstuffs North Island | 476.66 | Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | 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. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.184 | Not specified | Ryman supports in part where Design Guides are to be deleted as it is consistent 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. | Allow the submission points regarding deletions, subject to the relief sought by Ryman. | Reject | No |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.184 | Not specified | Ryman supports in part where Design Guides are to be deleted as it is consistent 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. | Allow the submission points regarding deletions, subject to the relief sought by Ryman. | Reject | No |
| Alan Fairless | Alan Fairless | FS135.1 | Support | Not specified. | Allow the submission in its entirety. | Reject | No |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|---|-------------------|--|-----------------|--|---|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Tapu-te-Ranga Trust | 297.36 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide | Support | Supports the recognition of papakāinga supporting Māori who don't necessarily whakapapa to a particular place, and as a concept of communal purchase of land by common Kaupapa to support intergenerational communal living. | Retain introduction 'What is a 'papakāinga' of the Papakāinga Residential Design Guide, as notified. | Accept | No |
| Tapu-te-Ranga Trust | 297.37 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide | Support | Support the recognition of urban papakāinga for mātāwaka who are wanting to live in more communal ways to support the revitalization of culture and te reo me ōna tikanga (language and its cultural practices). | Retain introduction 'What is a 'papakāinga' of the Papakāinga Residential Design Guide, as notified. | Accept | No |
| Tapu-te-Ranga Trust | 297.38 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide | Support | Supports the cross reference between the Residential Design Guide and the Papakāinga Design Guide. | Retain introduction 'Coordination with Residential Design Guide' of the Papakāinga Residential Design Guide, as notified. | Accept | No |
| Tapu-te-Ranga Trust | 297.39 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide | Support | Supports the inclusion of this section, and the identification of increased interest in medium and high density papakāinga models and associated kaupapa or principles underpinning papakāinga. | Retain 'Kaupapa' section of the Papakāinga Residential Design Guide, as notified. | Accept | No |
| Tapu-te-Ranga Trust | 297.40 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide | Support | Supports the guidelines included in the design guide. | Retain guidelines of the Papakāinga Residential Design Guide, as notified. | Accept | No |
| Tapu-te-Ranga Trust | 297.41 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide | Support | Supports glossary. | Retain glossary of the Papakāinga Residential Design Guide, as notified. | Accept | No |
| Greater Wellington Regional Council | 351.337 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide | Support in part | Supports the Papakāinga Design Guide and the approach to providing for papakāinga using guiding Kaupapa, as long as this design guide does not undermine tino rangatiratanga. Currently the District Plan only references this design guide for Tapu Te Ranga land in the Medium Density Residential Zone. | Retain the Papakāinga Design Guide with amendment. | Accept in part | No |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.69 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide | Oppose | The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission. | Disallow | Reject | No |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--|----------|--|--|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.69 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide | Oppose | Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Disallow | Reject | No |
| Greater Wellington Regional Council | 351.338 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide | 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 ensure the approach to providing for the occupation, use, development and ongoing relationship of mana whenua / tangata whenua with their ancestral land, and enabling Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms, has regard to direction from Policies UD.1 and UD.2 in Proposed RPS Change 1. | Seeks to clarify how the Papakāinga Design Guide will apply in areas outside the Tapu Te Ranga land. | Accept in part | No |
| Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira | 488.98 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Papakāinga Design Guide | Support | Supports the Papakāinga design guide | Retain Papakainga Design Guide as notified. [Inferred decision requested] | Accept | No |

| Submitter Name | Sub No / Point No | Sub-part / Chapter / Provision | Position | Summary of Submission | Decisions Requested | Officers Recommendation | Changes to PDP? |
|---|-------------------|--|----------------|---|---|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association | 123.64 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Support | Supports the endeavour to make the design guides more simplified and accessible as well as limiting the potential for different interpretations. | Retain Design Guides as notified. | Accept. | No. |
| Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association | 123.65 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Support | Supports the prioritisation of higher density urban form and living and the public outcomes over private amenities. | Not specified. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.5 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers that there is no mechanism for departing from the guidelines or clarity on how this will be assessed. | Seeks that the Design Guides include mechanism for departure from the guidelines, which should be tied into identified, relevant and numbered objectives or outcomes. | Accept in part. | Yes. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.9 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers that repetition should be eliminated from the Design Guides because the degree of overlap and repetition makes the document unnecessarily long, unwieldy and inefficient to apply. Because a point is made multiple times may not necessarily lead to efficient application, and it could give undue and unintended over-emphasis to some design direction. This would allow the design guides to be materially shortened without loss of content, and the task of applying them made considerably more efficient. | Seeks that the content of the Design Guides is restructured to eliminate repetition within individual design guides and edit to ensure consistency of expression of guidelines. | Accept in part. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.10 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers that in many cases a matter is dealt with in a section by multiple guidelines, when it would be equally effective and more efficient to combine into a reduced number of guidelines. An example is Residential GG99, G101 and G102 | Seeks that the content of the Design Guides is restructured to eliminate repetition within individual design guides and edit to ensure consistency of expression of guidelines. | Accept in part. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.11 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers that the guidelines in the design guides should be edited to ensure consistency of expression. Many are directive such as maintain visual connection...., Orientate building frontages; Use planting to..... But others are passive descriptive statements. Considers that the approach of being directive is preferred as it will enhance legibility and it will also allow the text to be shortened. | Seeks that the content of the Design Guides is restructured to eliminate repetition within individual design guides and edit to ensure consistency of expression of guidelines. | Accept in part. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.12 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose in part | Considers that the Design Guides inappropriately combine good practice in detailed building design, specification and construction which are properly covered at the time of building consent with issues which relate to the design, configuration and amenity effects of the building. Those matters should be stripped out as they require a level of detail that is inappropriate to develop and provide before resource consent is granted. That is due to the cost of providing that information in a situation where it may be quite uncertain whether a consent can/will be achieved. | Seeks that requirements for detailed information on construction, materials, services that is only reasonably developed following receipt of resource consent are removed. | Reject. | No. |
| Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited | 139.58 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Support | Generally supports the intent and provisions of the Design Guides. [Specific Design Guides not referenced] | Retain the Design Guides as notified. | Accept. | No. |
| Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited | 139.59 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | Opposes the City Outcomes Contribution - referenced in the Design Guides and PDP | Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contribution are removed from the Design Guides and Proposed District Plan policies. | Addressed in Hearing Stream 4 | |
| Amos Mann | 172.26 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Seeks that accessibility and universal design requirements are provided for in the Design Guides and in incentives. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.6 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | Inconsistent with the RVA's original submission which sought to exclude retirement villages from having to apply Design Guides. Council oversight is not required to retirement villages as the RVA is best placed to understand different operational and functional needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.6 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | Inconsistent with Ryman's original submission which sought to exclude retirement villages from having to apply Design Guides. Council oversight is not required to retirement villages as Ryman is best placed to understand different operational and functional needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Wellington City Youth Council | 201.42 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Supports making design guides clear and concise to facilitate easier access and accessible knowledge about design standards. | Seeks that design guides are clear and concise to facilitate easier access and accessible knowledge about design standards. | Accept in part. | No. |
| Wellington City Youth Council | 201.44 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission] | Seeks that new builds and developments are required to be safe for those with different access needs. | Accept. | No. |
| Wellington City Youth Council | 201.45 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission] | Seeks that design guides reward the use of environmentally sustainable building materials to promote climate friendly development. | Reject. | No. |
| Wellington City Youth Council | 201.46 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Supports and emphasises the importance of current, new, and renovation toward high-performance Buildings. | Not specified. | Accept. | No. |
| Wellington City Youth Council | 201.47 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Considers that partnering with mana whenua especially for high impact urban developments is essential to weaving te ao Māori throughout the urban landscape. | Not specified. | Accept. | No. |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|--|---------------|--|---|-------------------------------|-----|
| Go Media Ltd | 236.35 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Considers that the signs design guide is broad and open to interpretation. | Not specified. | Addressed in Hearing Stream 7 | |
| Alan Fairless | 242.24 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers that the District Plan is amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect of urban design to ensure that quality in design at a local level can be considered for the majority of developments. | Seeks that the Proposed District Plan is amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect of urban design and that this process is tied to community-level design guides as they are developed. | Reject. | No. |
| Alan Fairless | 242.25 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers that Wellington is a folded landscape with valleys and ridges, where a single large dwelling in the wrong place can adversely affect many others. The Plan needs to allow and adjust for this reality by adopting a more carefully tailored and locally nuanced approach, rather than a one-size-fits-all approach. Planning needs to drive and encourage quality and ensure the design of new, more intensive development works with the city's idiosyncratic landscape and for the communities in which it is located. | Seeks that the District Plan strengthen the urban design qualities of the city through a more sophisticated approach to design guidance, in particular the use of local design guides tailored to local areas. | Reject. | No |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.41 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Considers that for apartment developments both the Residential Design Guide and Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide will apply, with over 200 guidelines to be considered and work through. | Seeks rationalisation of the Residential Design Guide to reduce the number of guidelines as much as possible. | Accept in part. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.42 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Considers that for apartment developments both the Residential Design Guide and Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide will apply, with over 200 guidelines to be considered and work through. | Seeks rationalisation of the Mixed Use Design Guide to reduce the number of guidelines as much as possible. | Addressed in Stream 4 | |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.43 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Support | Considers that the ranking of guidelines within the Design Guides is appropriate. | Retain ranking system in Design Guides as notified. | Accept. | No. |
| Stratum Management Limited | 249.44 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Considers that it is unclear what the 'Outcomes' section of each Design Guide attempts to achieve. | Seeks that the 'Outcomes' that read as policies are included as policies, if that is the intention; alternatively deletion or appropriate qualification of the 'Outcomes'. | Reject. | No. |
| McDonald's | 274.75 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers 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 amendments to remove all direct references to the design guides in the PDP and for the relevant provisions to instead refer to the specific design outcomes that are being sought. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.182 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | The RVA supports in part the relief sought in this submission where it aligns with The RVA's primary submission to have these references removed but opposes relevant provisions instead referring to specific design guidelines to the extent these provisions apply to retirement villages. | Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to excluding retirement villages from any specific design principles as sought within the RVA's primary submission. | Reject. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.182 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Ryman supports in part the relief sought in this submission where it aligns with Ryman's primary submission to have these references removed but opposes relevant provisions instead referring to specific design guidelines to the extent these provisions apply to retirement villages. | Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to excluding retirement villages from any specific design principles as sought within Ryman's primary submission. | Reject. | |
| Roland Sapsford | 305.64 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers that the objectives and rules relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan rather than replace them with the minimum daylight provisions of the proposed Plan. | Seeks reinstatement of the operative district plan design guidance for minimum sunlight access [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |
| Carolyn Stephens | 344.13 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers that the plan should strengthen the urban design qualities of the city through a more sophisticated approach to design guidance, in particular the use of local design guides tailored to local areas. [Refer to original submission for full reason] | Seeks that urban design qualities be strengthened in Design Guides. | Reject. | No. |
| Greater Wellington Regional Council | 351.333 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers the design guides are one part of how the District Plan can give effect to the NPS-FM, and should rate freshwater matters with appropriate weight throughout the guides. The current ratings for guidelines for stormwater, freshwater bodies and water conservation are currently rated as having lowest weight in the residential design guide for example. | Seeks that Design Guides are amended as necessary to give effect to the NPS-FM, including by rating freshwater guidelines to recognise their importance. | Reject. | No. |
| Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group | FS112.19 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Support | Agree that the Design Guides can give effect to the NPS-FM and should prioritise measures that enhance freshwater and water conservation. | Allow | Reject. | |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.65 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.65 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Greater Wellington Regional Council | 351.334 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers the design guides are one part of how the District Plan can give effect to the NPS-FM, and should rate freshwater matters with appropriate weight throughout the guides. The current ratings for guidelines for stormwater, freshwater bodies and water conservation are currently rated as having lowest weight in the residential design guide for example. | Seeks to apply ratings for freshwater matters equally between the Rural Design Guide and the Urban Design Guide. | Addressed in stream 4 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--|---------------|---|--|-----------------------|-----|
| Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group | FS112.20 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Support | Agree that the Design Guides can give effect to the NPS-FM and should prioritise measures that enhance freshwater and water conservation. | Allow | Addressed in stream 4 | |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.66 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission. | Disallow | Addressed in stream 4 | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.66 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Disallow | Addressed in stream 4 | |
| Greater Wellington Regional Council | 351.335 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers that the Regional Standard for Water Services should be referenced directly through design guides, which provides technical engineering detail and contains specific infrastructure requirements for development. | Seeks to reference the Regional Standard for Water Services in Design Guides. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.67 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.67 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Greater Wellington Regional Council | 351.336 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers that the Regional Standard for Water Services is not referenced directly through design guides, which provides technical engineering detail and contains specific infrastructure requirements for development. | Seeks to ensure emphasis on water conservation throughout guides, including mandate for the use of rainwater tanks and other best practices for water conservation such as low-flow devices, in new developments | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.68 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.68 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Woolworths New Zealand | 359.95 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Considers that urban design aspirations in Design Guides should not be used as a veto for the operational and functional requirements of commercial activities in commercial zones, specifically supermarkets. The submitter considers that the inclusion of reference to Design Guides as matters of discretion in the PDP with respect to development in Centres and Mixed-Use zones and in terms of Signs elevates their statutory relevance whilst introducing a subjective yet prescriptive assessment framework that gives rise to uncertainty and unnecessary complexity in consenting, even with generally anticipated restricted discretionary activities. Specific to supermarkets, which are typically larger in scale than regular high street or boutique retail, building bulk and scale is a function of supermarkets' unique operational and functional requirements, which themselves can still be managed through consideration of design, bulk and location, however to a different standard than currently outlined in the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide. | Seeks that Design Guides are not used as a veto for the operational and functional requirements of commercial activities in commercial zones, specifically supermarkets. | Addressed in stream 4 | |
| Foodstuffs North Island | FS23.28 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Support | Submission point 359.95 (Design Guides General) has similar outcomes to FSNI submission point 476.1 and 476.102. | Allow | Addressed in stream 4 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--|-----------------|--|---|-----------------------|-----|
| Woolworths New Zealand | 359.96 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | <p>Considers that the status of the notification of these Guides, as well as their bearing on subsequent legal weighting as the plan-making process continues should be clarified.</p> <p>The PDP states that these Design Guides have been notified using the ISPP process, however, they have been referenced in the context of parts of the PDP which have been notified under both the ISPP process and the P1 Sch1 process.</p> <p>The status of these Guides would appear to be statutory by reference within the matters of discretion of relevance. Given the prescriptive, yet subjective, nature of the assessment, elevating these Guides to a statutory requirement for compliance or assessment is not considered appropriate or commensurate in respect of a restricted discretionary activity assessment.</p> <p>In the proposed consenting framework this means that the design of supermarket buildings will be considered against all matters within these Guides (which have been ranked via a rating system). The subjective nature of the Design Guides and their inclusion as matters of discretion for restricted discretionary activities is opposed by Woolworths as it is considered that restricted discretionary consent applications should be straightforward with clear discretion parameters. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p> | Seeks clarification on the status of the notification of Design Guides, as well as their subsequent legal weighting. | Addressed in stream 4 | |
| Elizabeth Nagel | 368.18 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | <p>Considers that the plan should be amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect of urban design. This is 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. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p> | Seeks that the plan be amended to encompass more new developments as controlled activities in respect to urban design. | Reject. | No. |
| Elizabeth Nagel | 368.19 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | <p>Considers that the plan should strengthen the urban design qualities of the city through a more sophisticated approach to design guidance, in particular the use of local design guides tailored to local areas. [Refer to original submission for full reason]</p> | Seeks that urban design qualities be strengthened in Design Guides. | Reject. | No. |
| Glenside Progressive Association Inc | 374.11 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | <p>Considers that Design guides should be stricter in restricting earthworks in elevated development area, particularly Upper Stebbings and Glenside West.</p> | Seeks that Design Guides be stricter in restricting earthworks in elevated development areas, particularly Upper Stebbings and Glenside West. | Reject. | No. |
| Lincolnshire Farm Ltd, Hunters Hill Ltd, Best Farm Ltd, Stebbings Farmland | FS75.6 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | <p>The proposed development areas of Upper Stebbings Valley and Glenside West represent logical and planned extensions to the existing urban areas that they adjoin. Infrastructure can be extended to serve these areas including roading, water and drainage as well as power and fibre that has been reticulated to the boundary of these areas. These new areas are important to accommodate the growing needs of the City and can be well served by public transport (including the #1 Bus). As with all greenfield areas in Wellington, some earthworks are required to provide access roads and building areas and this is the reality of developing land in Wellington. It has also been necessary to review how much of the ridgelines can be protected to accommodate this growth.</p> | Disallow | Accept | |
| WCC Environmental Reference Group | 377.516 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Support in part | <p>Generally supportive.</p> | Not specified. | Accept. | No. |
| Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities | 391.765 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose in part | <p>The inclusion of Design Guidelines in the Plan is opposed, as they act as de facto rules to be complied with. Any policy or rule approach which would require development proposals to comply with such design guidelines in the District Plan is opposed.</p> <p>The Design Guidelines should be treated as a non-statutory tool. If there is content of a Design Guideline that Council wants in the Plan, it is sought that that these are relocated within a specific rule, matter of discretion or assessment criterion.</p> <p>Where particular design outcomes are to be achieved, these should be specified in matters of discretion or assessment.</p> | Remove Design Guides from within the District Plan, as well as any references or requirements related to Design Guides. Treat Design Guides as non-statutory tools, outside of the District Plan. | Reject. | No |
| Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc | FS39.24 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | <p>Submitter 391 seeks to omit references to Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide from the Plan. The Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide are important for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criteria.</p> | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Wellington's Character Charitable Trust | FS82.128 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | <p>Considers the Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.</p> | Disallow | Accept. | |
| LIVE WELLington | FS96.45 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | <p>Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.</p> | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Roland Sapsford | FS117.44 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | <p>Residential Design Guide and Heritage Design Guide is a valuable touchstone for testing proposed development and ought to be a statutory criterion.</p> | Disallow | Accept. | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|--|---------------|---|--|-----------------|-----|
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.165 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission. | Reject | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.165 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission. | Reject | |
| Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities | 391.766 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers that Design Guidelines should sit outside the Plan as guidance regarding best practice design outcomes. (Option A) | Seeks that a note be added in the District Plan as follows: <u>1. Acceptable means of compliance and best practice urban design guidance is contained within the Council's Design Guidelines.</u> | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.166 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission. | Reject | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.166 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission. | Reject | |
| Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities | 391.767 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers that design guidelines should be amended, simplified, and written in a manner that is easy to follow. The outcomes sought in the guidelines should read as desired requirements with sufficient flexibility to provide for a design that fits and works on site, rather than rules that a consent holder must follow and adhere to. Otherwise, there is no flexibility and scope to create a design that fits with specific site characteristics and desired built form development. (Option B) | Amend Design Guidelines to clarify and simplify them. [See original submission for further details]. | Accept in part. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.167 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission. | Accept in part | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.167 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission. | Accept in part | |
| Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities | 391.768 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers that Kāinga Ora should get the opportunity to review Design Guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document. (Option C) | Seeks that Kāinga Ora be allowed to review Design Guidelines. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.168 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission. | Reject. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.168 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission. | Reject. | |
| Investore Property Limited | 405.138 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | 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. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.109 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | 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. | Reject. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.109 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | 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. | Reject. | |
| Guy Marriage | 407.8 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers that a multi-unit specific design guide is much needed. [See original submission for full reason] | Seeks the addition of a Multi-Unit Design Guide. | Reject. | No. |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|--|-----------------|--|--|-----------------------|-----|
| Guy Marriage | 407.9 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers that while the Facades section of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide has 4 points listed under Facades (and no such Star system ***) and 9 points regarding Artificial Lighting, there is no associated rating for Natural Lighting, or Sunlight and that all these points need to be related. | Seeks that points on Facades, Artificial Lighting, Natural Lighting and Sunlight need to be related. | Addressed in stream 4 | |
| Guy Marriage | 407.10 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Considers that access to natural light and daylight and sunlight is just as important in the Inner City Housing as it is in suburban areas. | Not specified. | Accept in part. | No. |
| Cheryl Robilliard | 409.7 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Support | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission] | Retain Design Guides as notified. | Accept. | No. |
| VicLabour | 414.51 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | [Inferred decision requested] Seeks the prioritisation of pedestrian experience, including the emphasis on accessibility, for subdivisions. | Accept in part. | No. |
| VicLabour | 414.52 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Considers that accessibility needs to be a key focus throughout the plan. | Seeks that the Council considers recommendations from disabled people and advocates and explore co-design with remuneration where appropriate. | Accept in part. | No. |
| VicLabour | 414.53 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Supports references to waste minimisation. | Seeks that provisions for waste minimisation should be strengthened where possible | Reject. | No. |
| VicLabour | 414.54 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Support | Supports emphasis on mitigating stormwater problems, and particularly endorse the water conservation guidelines | Retain design guidance relating to mitigating storm water and water conservation. [inferred decision requested] | Accept. | No. |
| VicLabour | 414.55 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Seeks that ecology guidelines should incorporate a te ao Māori perspective | Accept in part. | No. |
| VicLabour | 414.56 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Support guidelines around the installation of place-based site interpretation. | Seeks a greater emphasis on recognising history of places and sites in a way that is not settler perspective dominant | Reject. | No. |
| VicLabour | 414.57 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Seeks that the design guides include direction that within walking catchments of the central city transport links car parking may not be required, with emphasis on accessibility. | Reject. | No. |
| VicLabour | 414.58 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Supports sustainable building and considers more can be done. | Seeks that a low emissions design guide be made compulsory. | Reject. | No. |
| Willis Bond and Company Limited | 416.197 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Support in part | Supports the intent of the Design Guides, their inclusion in the PDP significantly expands the matters Council must consider when exercising its discretion and, perversely, may even limit Council's flexibility to promote quality design outcomes. While well-intentioned, the Design Guides may become a 'tick-box' exercise and may discourage innovation. Our proposal is to make the Design Guides nonstatutory; they should be a useful 'how-to' resource (for example, like the Auckland Design Manual) which developers and Council can turn to when considering the design of new developments. It also provides more flexibility to adjust the Guides over time, as requirements and preferred design outcomes evolve, without requiring a plan change process. | Supports the intent of the design guides, but seeks that these are non-statutory. | Reject. | No. |
| Willis Bond and Company Limited | 416.198 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Supports the intent of the Design Guides, their inclusion in the PDP significantly expands the matters Council must consider when exercising its discretion and, perversely, may even limit Council's flexibility to promote quality design outcomes. While well-intentioned, the Design Guides may become a 'tick-box' exercise and may discourage innovation. Our proposal is to make the Design Guides nonstatutory; they should be a useful 'how-to' resource (for example, like the Auckland Design Manual) which developers and Council can turn to when considering the design of new developments. It also provides more flexibility to adjust the Guides over time, as requirements and preferred design outcomes evolve, without requiring a plan change process. | Amend the Design Guides to be non-statutory [Inferred decision requested]. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.261 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with the RVA's primary submission. | Reject. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.261 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission. | Reject. | |
| Willis Bond and Company Limited | 416.200 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers that maximum building depth is too restrictive and the submitter does not consider that it meets the section 32 Resource Management Act 1991 tests for appropriateness. | Submitter suggests that Council may wish to include the maximum building depth provision in a non statutory Design Guide. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.262 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with the RVA's primary submission. | Reject. | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|--|---------------|---|---|-----------------|-----|
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.262 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission. | Reject. | |
| Willis Bond and Company Limited | 416.201 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | 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. - 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). | 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. | Reject. | No. |
| Foodstuffs North Island | FS23.103 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Support | Submission point 416.201 supports submission points 476.1 & 476.102. | Allow | Reject | |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.263 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with the RVA's primary submission. | Reject | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.263 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission. | Reject | |
| Willis Bond and Company Limited | 416.202 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | 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. - 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). | Seeks that if the Design Guides are to be retained, the Design Guides should be significantly pared back and reviewed for double-up / alignment with the objectives and policies in Part 3. | Accept in part. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.264 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with the RVA's primary submission. | Accept in part. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.264 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission. | Accept in part. | |
| Willis Bond and Company Limited | 416.203 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | 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. - 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). | Seeks that if the Design Guides are to be retained, the Design Guides should be significantly pared back and reviewed for double-up / alignment with the objectives and policies in Part 3. | Accept in part. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.265 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission. | Accept in part. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.265 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission. | Accept in part. | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|--|-----------------|---|---|-----------------|-----|
| Willis Bond and Company Limited | 416.204 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | 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 queries how the 'Outcomes' in the Design Guides are to be read alongside other provisions in the plan. - 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). | Seeks that Council consider a Design Excellence Panel (or similar) which is constituted for each project (with representatives agreed by Council and the developer) and is charged with ensuring the development achieves the quality urban outcomes sought by Council. Submitter notes that provided approval is obtained from the Design Excellence Panel, Council would not have discretion to consider urban outcomes (to ensure there is no overlap of roles between Council and the Design Excellence Panel). | Accept in part. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.266 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with the RVA's primary submission. | Accept in part. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.266 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission. | Accept in part. | |
| Fabric Property Limited | 425.105 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Submitter supports the intent and provisions of the design guides. However, 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. 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 does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and it would be onerous to potentially address two design guides in the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications. Submitter seeks amendments to remove all direct references to the design guides in the Proposed Plan and for the relevant district plan provisions to instead refer to the specific design outcomes that are being sought. As above, 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, and can be appropriately referenced in the relevant plan provisions in the following way "For guidance, refer to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide". Considers that the Centres and Mixed Use, and Residential design guides have the potential to overlap and conflict with each other. Some activities, such as construction of buildings, may require separate design assessments under the two design guides. To avoid conflict and duplication the design guides should be combined into a single document. | Seeks that Design Guides are removed from the Proposed District Plan and used as external reference documents. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.29 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the 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, as they 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 line with the RVA's primary submission. | Reject. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.29 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | 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, as they 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 line with Ryman's primary submission. | Reject. | |
| Miriam Moore | 433.20 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Support in part | Support of the design guides holding statutory weight as a matter of discretion in the PDP. | Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points. | Retain. | No. |
| Miriam Moore | 433.21 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Support in part | Considers that assessments against the Design Guide(s) could take extra time in the consenting process. Seeks that the Council is well-resourced in Design Review, and works well with developers to get good and timely outcomes. Hopes the enforcement of design guides can achieve a good number of accessible homes - Auckland's similar intensification rules have resulted in many multi-storey terraced homes, while these are good compact designs for family homes, they exclude our ageing population and those who aren't able bodied. Believes Wellington needs density to be inclusive and done well to bring those on board, who may be nervous about the changes coming. | Seeks consent efficiency. | Reject. | No. |
| Paul M Blaschke | 435.11 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Support | Supports the widespread use of Design Guides and their inclusion in the statutory plan. | Retain Design Guides as notified. | Accept. | No. |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|--|-----------------|---|--|---------|-----|
| Marilyn Head | 457.8 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers the landscaping standards to be too low. [Refer to original submission for full reason] | Not specified. | Reject. | No. |
| Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's | 459.14 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers it is appropriate to amend design guide as enough capability in the current plan to accommodate the projected population growth. | Seeks to amend the design guides. [inferred decision requested]. | Reject. | No. |
| Anita Gude and Simon Terry | 461.31 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Support in part | Considers that the WCC's latest revisions of the design guides has produced a lot of very good changes. There are now far clearer descriptions of what defines the character that is sought to be protected, compared to that laid out in the versions that accompanied the draft district plan. | Not specified. | Accept. | No. |
| Stride Investment Management Limited | 470.63 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Support in part | Supports in general the intent and provisions of the design guides. | Not specified. | Accept. | No. |
| Stride Investment Management Limited | 470.64 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Amend | Considers that it is important that design guides are reference documents that sit outside of the district plan. Including them in the district plan elevates them into standards, rather than guidance. Considers that it is not appropriate to provide that the councils discretion is restricted to all matters in design guides. The design guides do not provide any clear direction or certainty for applicants and it is onerous to potentially need to address two design guides. | Seeks that the design guides are used as reference documents which sit outside of the district plan | Reject. | No. |
| Foodstuffs North Island | 476.102 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Support in part | 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. | Remove the design guides from the plan and instead revise provisions to refer to the specific design outcomes that are being sought. | Reject. | No. |
| Living Streets Aotearoa | 482.62 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Seeks that the Design Guides ensure that there are no blank frontages. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.174 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.174 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Living Streets Aotearoa | 482.63 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Seeks that the Design Guides ensure that entryways are designed so people entering buildings can move off the public space while they do that (e.g. while they find their keys or seek permission to enter). | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.175 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.175 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Living Streets Aotearoa | 482.64 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Considers that the worst possible outcome for pedestrians is that they are in a cold, wet space that never dries out in winter because it never gets any sun. | Seeks that the Design Guides ensure that buildings do not unduly shade public space unless they are providing a verandah. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.176 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.176 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Living Streets Aotearoa | 482.65 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Not specified | Considers that there are a number of buildings in Wellington that generate their own weather in the adjacent public square eg. Majestic Centre. | Seeks that the Design Guides ensure that design does not generate wind problems. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.177 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. | Disallow | Accept. | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|--|---------------|---|--|-----------------|-----|
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.177 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Historic Places Wellington | 182.31 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide | Amend | Considers that the design guides as notified are too 'loose'. | Seeks a new multi unit design guide to ensure that new development is well designed and will complement the predominant patterns of local neighbourhoods. [Inferred decision requested] | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.72 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide | 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, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.72 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide | 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, given retirement villages have substantially different operational and functional needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Historic Places Wellington | 182.32 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide | Not specified | Considers that urban design panels could be used as part of the assessment process [of the new multi unit design guide]. [Refer to original submission]. | Not specified. | Accept in part. | No. |
| Alan Fairless | 242.26 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide | Amend | Considers that local Design Guides, founded on a sophisticated understanding of local character, are a proven and effective vehicle for addressing good residential quality. | Seeks that local design guides, tailored to local areas, are created and used to strengthen the urban design qualities of the city. [Inferred decision requested]. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.5 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide | Oppose | Inconsistent with the RVA's original submission which sought to exclude retirement villages from having to apply Design Guides. Council oversight is not required to retirement villages as the RVA is best placed to understand different operational and functional needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.5 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide | Oppose | Inconsistent with Ryman's original submission which sought to exclude retirement villages from having to apply Design Guides. Council oversight is not required to retirement villages as Ryman is best placed to understand different operational and functional needs. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Wellington Branch NZIA | 301.13 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide | Amend | Considers that the Multi-Unit Design Guide should be reinstated, or otherwise brought back in a revised form. | Seeks that the Multi-Unit Design Guide be reinstated. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.226 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide | Oppose | The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and The RVA seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.226 | Part 4 / Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide | Oppose | Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, noting that design guides do not provide for the benefits of retirement villages or recognise their functional and operational needs and Ryman seeks for these to be deleted in full. | Disallow | Accept. | |
| Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's | 459.15 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide | Amend | Considers that this would be a great move to sustainability. Considers that a 'must' have rather than a negotiation to get more height and induce more shading for others, if it is installed. | Seeks that all new developments must have solar or wind for communal lighting and heating. | Reject. | No. |
| Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's | 459.16 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide | Amend | Considers that there will never be another chance to include this in a building than when it is built. Considers that retrofitting will be expensive. | Seeks that water conservation would be madatory in design guides. [Inferred decision requested]. | Reject. | No. |
| Craig Palmer | 492.49 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / New design guide | Amend | [No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]. | Seeks that Design Guides are introduced for all verandahs. [Refer to original submission for full guidance on verandah design guide notes]. | Reject. | No. |
| Investore Property Limited | 405.5 | Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | 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. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.75 | General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | 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. | Reject. | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|---|---------------|---|---|-----------------|-----|
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.75 | General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | 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. | Reject. | |
| Investore Property Limited | 405.6 | Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | 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]. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.76 | General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | 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. | Reject. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.76 | General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | 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. | Reject. | |
| Willis Bond and Company Limited | 416.3 | Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | 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. | Accept in part. | No. |
| Willis Bond and Company Limited | 416.6 | Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | 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. - 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). | 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. | Reject. | No. |
| The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated | FS126.252 | General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | Not specified | The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission. | Reject. | |
| Ryman Healthcare Limited | FS128.252 | General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | Not specified | Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. | Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission. | Reject. | |
| Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's | 459.3 | Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | Not specified | Considers that there should be mandatory design requirements. [Refer to original submission for full reason] | Add mandatory design requirements. [inferred decision requested]. | Reject. | No. |
| Foodstuffs North Island | 476.66 | Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP | 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. | Reject. | No. |
| McIndoe Urban Limited | 135.8 | Design Guides Subpart / Design Guides / Design Guides General | Oppose | Considers that the function of the Design Guide introduction is not clear, other than providing the rationale for the approach taken through the suite of guides. If that is the case, it is useful information for this process of explaining and implementing a new set of guides. But it does not and need to be and should not be within the set of statutory Design Guides. | Seeks that the Design Guide Introduction is removed from the Proposed District Plan. | Reject. | No. |