

# **Wellington City Proposed District Plan**

## **REPORT 2A**

### **Appendix 3.2**

#### **Medium Density Residential Zone**

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

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greg Coyle	39.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that any building over two storeys will shade roof-top solar panels and make these useless. Therefore written approval should be required if development is occurring next to a site with solar panels.	Seeks that neighbours' approval is required for any development next to a site that has roof top solar panels.	Reject.	No.
Karen Serjeantson	43.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Considers that the recent government amendments for denser housing have not taken into account older, unique areas such as Roseneath where properties can have no bordering street. Considers that the building of a 12-metre high house on the North side of 95 Grafton Road could restrict sunlight access to the house and change the outlook to a huge wall - which could be expected in the city centre but not the residential area. Seeks that space between houses is maintained for passive solar access.	Not specified.	Reject.	No.
Robert and Chris Gray	46.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Considers that the PDP growth estimates need to allow for children's primary education and day centres in the Mount Victoria area.	Not specified.	Accept in part.	No.
Robert and Chris Gray	46.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Considers that allowing the neighbour at 43 Porritt Avenue to build higher than an 11 metre building would block the sun and make any solar panels, if installed, redundant.	Seeks that existing utilities such as solar panels, skylights etc. on neighbouring properties will be considered and safeguarded in the consent decision making process.	Reject.	No.
Robert and Chris Gray	46.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Seeks clarification as to whether the Council will reimburse the cost of setting up solar and provide a replacement solution for alternative energy.	Seeks clarification.	Reject.	No.
Shailesh Kumar Patel	49.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Opposes the restrictions and provisions on site in the Air Noise Overlay, which mean that Council and Wellington Airport permission is required for subdivision and infill new housing on the existing section.  Currently the Airport is not giving any permission for subdivision and infill on the existing section for resident housing as well as commercial buildings.  Considers that sites in the Air Noise Boundary should have the same development rights as sites outside this (i.e. be able to build in accordance with the MDRS).	Seeks that council ease restrictions on subdivision and infill housing in the Air Noise Boundary so that these sites have the development potential available under the MDRS.	Addressed in Report 5A.	
Michael Hamilton	53.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	PDP does not protect or acknowledge existing heating and energy consumption patterns of storey bungalows that make up most of Karori and will lose passive-heating if with no protections.  Loss of passive heating during winter will require alternative heating methods which consume more energy and have a larger carbon footprint.  Retrofits to account for changes in passive heating will be expensive for property owners.  [Refer to original submission for further detail, including attachments]	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter is amended to recognise and protect the energy efficiency and energy consumption of the existing housing stock, through recognising these effects as a resource with their own protections, or new developments should not be allowed to impact existing dwellings energy daytime energy requirements by more than 10%.	Reject.	No.
Trace Quinn	54.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that 369 Adelaide Road would benefit from increased height control to 21 meters, rather than the current 14m limit. The site has potential for housing development that will depend on the outcome of the district plan changes. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that height control be increased from 14m to 21m at 369 Adelaide Rd.	Reject.	No.
Judith Ellen Bleach	60.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that challenging the heritage status of areas and properties in Wellington by the WCC in the name of progress has been a superficial process.  There has been serious concern expressed by residents.	Reinstate the Officers Recommended Plan as notified.	Reject.	No.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	F568.43	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Supports submission seeking extending character precincts in Owen Street Newtown.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Susan Rotto	63.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	MRZ-P8.4 (Achieve attractive and safe streets), MRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) and MRZ-R6 (Visitor accommodation) cannot work without provision for off-street parking.  Lack of off-street parking drives parking on-street which packs up streets, which are unsafe and provide no space for workers.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter is amended to require at least one off-street car park per residential unit on a site.	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Susan Rotto	63.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	MRZ-P8.4 (Achieve attractive and safe streets), MRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) and MRZ-R6 (Visitor accommodation) cannot work without provision for off-street parking.  Lack of off-street parking drives parking on-street which packs up streets, which are unsafe and provide no space for workers.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter is amended to require 1 > off-street car parks on sites that are used for non-residential purposes.	Reject.	No.
Juliet Cooke	68.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that CCZ standards will lead to inappropriate, out of scale development with a direct impact on residential properties that have recognised heritage and character values and are therefore contrary to the objectives and policies of the plan.  Heritage and character are qualifying matters under MRZ Pt1 Sch 1.  The height limits in Height Control Area 9 would allow inappropriate scale of development adjacent to land which is zoned for residential purposes or has character or heritage overlay.  Moir Street will have adverse effects due to the potential for development in neighbouring CCZ zoning.  Moir street is a key and coherent character and heritage area.  Moir street is unique with the amount of overlapping relevant overlays.  [See submission for further detail]	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter appropriately considers the transition between the Medium Density Residential Zone and the City Centre Zone to protect heritage and character values.	Reject. Addressed in Report 4B also	No.
Brett McKay	69.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Opposes MRZ provisions in their entirety.	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 Murcott	F571.2	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	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.	No.
Brett McKay	69.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the Council should recraft provisions for the inner residential neighbourhoods that will achieve reasonable intensification whilst maintaining and enhancing the existing valued housing stock.  This will require objectives and policies that recognise both residential character and heritage qualities supported by rules with 'teeth' to ensure appropriate implementation.	Seeks that the Council devise new provisions relating to intensification of residential neighbourhoods.	Reject.	No.
Richard Murcott	F571.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	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.	No.
Judith Graykowski	80.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the PDP will result in a random scattering of tower blocks in the Mount Victoria area. These blocks will dominate and shade existing neighbours in what is mainly a one or two storey residential suburb.  This has considerable potential for poor health outcomes and resentment.	Seeks that the maximum building height is reduced to 11 or 14 metres for a much greater proportion of the Mount Victoria area.	Reject.	No.
Rachel Marr	89.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that residential multi-unit developments affect neighbours and need to be notified.	Seeks that notification of multi-unit developments is required. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Hugh Good	90.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Considers that 3-waters infrastructure should not be a qualifying matter that governs where development takes place.	Seeks that three waters infrastructure should not be a qualifying matter that governs where development takes place.	Reject.	No.
Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.
Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Anne Lian	132.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards.	Reject.	No.
Anne Lian	132.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.
Anne Lian	132.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what is proposed.	Reject.	No.
Anne Lian	132.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.
Ingo Schommer	133.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards.	Reject.	No.
Ingo Schommer	133.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.
Ingo Schommer	133.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.
Olivier Reuland	134.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards.	Reject.	No.
Olivier Reuland	134.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.
Olivier Reuland	134.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what is proposed.	Reject.	No.
Olivier Reuland	134.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.
Ella Patterson	138.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject.	No.
Ella Patterson	138.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.
Grant Buchan	143.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that all inconsistencies between the NPS-UD and MDRS should be removed (in favour of NPS-UD directions).	Seeks that all NPS-UD (National Policy Statement on Urban Development) recommendations are adhered to in the Medium Density Residential Zones.  [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part.	No.
Grant Buchan	143.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards.	Reject.	No.
Grant Buchan	143.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Grant Buchan	143.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what's proposed.	Reject.	No.
Grant Buchan	143.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.
Braydon White	146.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations with respect to building height limits, recession planes and setbacks.	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards.	Reject.	No.
Braydon White	146.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.
David Stevens	151.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Considers that four storey buildings sometimes may be appropriate in specific locations throughout the area from Broadmeadows to Crofton Downs or for example on the downside of a road, where the ground floor is effectively below normal pavement level, leaving not much more than three storeys visible at street level.	Seeks that four storey buildings throughout the area from Broadmeadows to Crofton Downs should only be considered on a case-by-case basis via notifiable resource consent applications.	Reject.	No.
Matpor Holdings Ltd	152.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that their property is underutilised and should be provided for to allow improvements whilst meeting the character requirements for the street [thought to be on Brougham Street - not specified].  The property is only a single level dwelling on a good size site with under 40% site coverage in a location very close to the city.  [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that improvements, meeting the character requirements for the street, to the submitter's property [thought to be on Brougham Street - not specified] should be provided for whilst only requiring a building consent.  [Inferred decision requested].	Reject.	No.
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations with respect to building height limits, recession planes and setbacks.	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standard recommendations.	Reject.	No.
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Seeks that five dwellings, not three, should be a permitted activity.	Seeks that five units can be constructed as a permitted activity.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.53	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Considers the submission point is inconsistent with the NPS-UD and MDRS.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.87	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	This would be inconsistent with the NPS-UD and MDRS	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what's proposed.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Stephen Minto	FS100.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter 234 wants to reduce shading as an issue when designing a development. But if people have solar panels on their house then this is an ongoing financial benefit that is lost. Compensation has not been considered or discussed in the submission. The criticality of sunlight to well being. It should be a right to have it in your house. It is known to help house sales so it has a value and the submitters place no value on it.</p> <p>Appreciates the submitter wants more houses and assumes they want affordable housing. Instead wants affordable housing and sees densification as having merits in the right places. Like in the brownfields of Te Aro. Not by ripping the heart out of our heritage/ character suburbs. Our heritage/character suburbs are a finite asset that is special to NZ. Tourists talk about it being special and different. Our heritage is part of continuity with our past. And being connected to the past is a critical part of becoming aware of our identity as New Zealanders. Heritage gives us a sense of place. Our place. Try getting Parisians to pull down the Eiffel Tower now.</p> <p>Heritage buildings and character areas connect to the trees that covered our land and were destroyed. Respecting heritage houses gives us a chance to still see the beauty of their wood. The trees that are special to NZ. The Rimu reds, the various stains, the hardness of Matai. The connection to what makes NZ. So when we plant and replace it will mean a deeper understanding of the beauty that was destroyed. Protecting heritage therefore helps connect us to a better future and an awareness that we should not let that destruction happen again.</p> <p>Wellington has already lost most of its character and heritage from the central city. Lambton Quay destroyed but its no safer from earthquakes in fact less safe. Heritage and character just aren't looked after so they often are poor quality. Requiring them to be done up to an excellent standard would be cheaper and less carbon intensive than building new. Note: Cities can shape well being and happiness as well. They aren't just cost effective rooms to sleep in. [Inferred reference to submission point 234.7]</p>	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
James and Karen Fairhall	160.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the Proposed District Plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (MRZ) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.	Reject.	No.
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (MRZ) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.	Addressed in Report 4B	
Jill Ford	163.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	<p>Considers that there is the opportunity in places like Newtown, for taller multi-story units to be developed in a more consistent way, e.g. along Riddiford Street shopping as opposed to randomly amongst smaller housing.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned about sporadic six storey buildings beside small older homes.</p>	Seeks that taller multi-story units are developed in a consistent way as opposed to randomly amongst smaller housing.	Reject.	No.
Jill Ford	163.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Considers that sunlight is important for a carbon-zero lifestyle as it fuels solar panels, helps gardens grow, dries the washing, and heats people's homes. If tall buildings are able to overshadow low-rise homes the latter risk becoming cold and damp, leading to illness, and in some cases the homes will become unfit for purpose. Sunlight is vital for everyday life. With new developments the standards require a certain amount of sunlight access but there is no guarantee of this being protected for existing neighbouring properties.	<p>Seeks that sunlight protection is provided for existing neighbourhood properties.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject.	No.
Jill Ford	163.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.
Amos Mann	172.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations.	Reject.	No.
Amos Mann	172.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.
Amos Mann	172.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Patrick Wilkes	173.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations.	Reject.	No.
Patrick Wilkes	173.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.
Patrick Wilkes	173.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what's proposed.	Reject.	No.
Patrick Wilkes	173.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (Medium density Residential Zone) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.	Reject.	No.
Pete Gent	179.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations.	Reject.	No.
Pete Gent	179.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.
Pete Gent	179.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what's proposed.	Reject.	No.
Pete Gent	179.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.
James Harris	180.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.
James Harris	180.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that strong controls on shading caused by proposed new developments are required such as build to the sun, enabling passive solar house, and solar panels.	Reject.	No.
Athena Papadopoulos	183.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (MRZ) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.	Addressed in Report 4B	
Lara Bland	184.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (MRZ) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.	Addressed in Report 4B	
Emma Baines	185.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Supports the PDP heights for Cockayne Road, Khandallah.	Retain proposed building heights for Cockayne Road as notified.	Reject.	No.
Ros Bignell	186.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the existing newer, infill townhouses on Lawrence Street are positioned such that they have a relatively low impact on the overall streetscape. This might be similarly possible with new 3 storey (11 metres height) townhouses or residential buildings but not with 4 storey multi dwelling buildings of up to 14 metres.	Seeks that the building height limit in Lawrence Street is reduced from 14m to 11m.  [Inferred decision requested].	Accept	Yes.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	F568.25	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Supports submission seeking that character protections should extend to Lawrence Street, Newtown.	Allow	Accept.	Yes.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Geoff Palmer	188.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (MRZ) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.	Addressed in Report 4B	
Chris Howard	192.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Considers that some housing intensification [Inferred in the inner residential area] is warranted, e.g. allowing 3 homes on many sections, (rather than a limit of 2).	Allow three houses on many sites in the inner residential area.  [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part.	No.
Chris Howard	192.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Considers that sites with wide street frontages are typically more suited to medium density housing than those with deep set backs that would require 'sausage flat' housing, which the submitter considers is unattractive.	Only allow medium density housing on sites with wide street frontages.  [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Chris Howard	192.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Considers that sites with wide street frontages are typically more suited to medium density housing than those with deep set backs that would require 'sausage flat' housing, which the submitter considers is unattractive.	Seeks that the Council review how other councils such as Auckland Council are addressing the issue and incorporate additional safeguards in the plan.	Reject.	No.
Michael O'Rourke	194.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Supports the attempts in the MRZ to make new builds more liveable with regard to required outdoor space.	Not specified.	Accept in part.	No.
Michael O'Rourke	194.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Supports that the MRZ to some extent attempts to mitigate the impact of higher buildings on neighbouring properties.	Not specified.	Accept in part.	No.
Peter Nunns	196.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Supports the extension of medium density residential zone to Berhampore, including the Chatham Street neighbourhood.	Retain Medium Density Residential Zone mapping in Berhampore as notified.	Accept.	No.
Peter Nunns	196.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards.	Reject.	No.
Peter Nunns	196.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.
Peter Nunns	196.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.
Andrew Flanagan	198.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards.	Reject.	No.
Andrew Flanagan	198.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.
Andrew Flanagan	198.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.
Anne Lian	198.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what is proposed.	Reject.	No.
LIVE WELLington	F596.51	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Sunlight is important for health and well-being, as well as practical applications such as passive heating and solar PV. Retain or improve allowance for sunlight.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.



## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Considers that it is not fair nor reasonable that the outer northern suburbs deal with the brunt of intensification, while the inner suburbs that are close walking distance to the CBD or on the proposed light-rail route, appear not to be included in the six-plus storey building densification plans.  This will increase the value of the already costly inner suburbs while the comparably more affordable outer suburbs will decrease in value.	Seeks that Ngaio and Khandallah should not be expected to accommodate the construction of six-storey residential buildings to ease the housing affordability crisis but not other Wellington suburbs which are within walking distance of the central city.	Reject.	No.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.29	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Supports the upzoning of residential land to medium-density, in keeping with the MDRS.  Considers that this will allow more housing across current suburbs, providing more choice for young people of where to live in the future and reducing reliance on new greenfield developments.	Retain MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Avryl Bramley	202.31	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that non demolition rules should be extended to other building cohorts that are durable.	Seeks non-demolition rules for other building cohort eras that have produced durable residential buildings.	Reject.	No.
Dougal and Libby List	207.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the Proposed District Plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (Medium Density Residential Zone) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.	Reject.	No.
Craig Forrester	210.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (MRZ) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.	Addressed in Report 4B	
Richard W Keller	232.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.
Richard W Keller	232.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what is proposed.	Reject.	No.
Richard W Keller	232.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.	Reject.	No.
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS.	Reject.	No.
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what is proposed.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Stephen Minto	FS100.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter 234 wants to reduce shading as an issue when designing a development. But if people have solar panels on their house then this is an ongoing financial benefit that is lost. Compensation has not been considered or discussed in the submission. The criticality of sunlight to well being. It should be a right to have it in your house. It is known to help house sales so it has a value and the submitters place no value on it.</p> <p>Appreciates the submitter wants more houses and assumes they want affordable housing. Instead wants affordable housing and sees densification as having merits in the right places. Like in the brownfields of Te Aro. Not by ripping the heart out of our heritage/ character suburbs. Our heritage/character suburbs are a finite asset that is special to NZ. Tourists talk about it being special and different. Our heritage is part of continuity with our past. And being connected to the past is a critical part of becoming aware of our identity as New Zealanders. Heritage gives us a sense of place. Our place. Try getting Parisians to pull down the Eiffel Tower now.</p> <p>Heritage buildings and character areas connect to the trees that covered our land and were destroyed. Respecting heritage houses gives us a chance to still see the beauty of their wood. The trees that are special to NZ. The Rimu reds, the various stains, the hardness of Matai. The connection to what makes NZ. So when we plant and replace it will mean a deeper understanding of the beauty that was destroyed. Protecting heritage therefore helps connect us to a better future and an awareness that we should not let that destruction happen again.</p> <p>Wellington has already lost most of its character and heritage from the central city. Lambton Quay destroyed but its no safer from earthquakes in fact less safe. Heritage and character just aren't looked after so they often are poor quality. Requiring them to be done up to an excellent standard would be cheaper and less carbon intensive than building new. Note: Cities can shape well being and happiness as well. They aren't just cost effective rooms to sleep in. [Inferred reference to submission point 234.7]</p>	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.
Regan Dooley	239.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS.	Reject.	No.
Regan Dooley	239.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Considers that the definition of "residential activity" entirely captures supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama, and therefore a separate definition of "supported residential care activities" is unnecessary.	Remove the references to "supported residential care activity" from the Medium Density Residential zone.	Accept.	Yes.
Prime Property Group	256.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	<p>Spenmoor area defined in the district plan restricts any multi residential development in this area by seeking further assessments with respect to traffic.</p> <p>Considers that the street is no worse than others in Newlands that do not have a specific policy focussed on traffic effects and roading capacity.</p> <p>Works are scheduled which negate the need for the policy and further assessment of traffic effects [Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Seeks to remove all references in the chapter to Spenmoor Street Area.	Accept.	Yes.
Wellington City Council	266.131	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers introduction to the chapter needs to be amended to include reference to inundation areas as a qualifying matter.	<p>Amend paragraph 6 of the Medium Density Residential Zone Introduction as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stream corridors, <del>and</del> overland flow paths <u>and inundation areas</u> (refer to Natural Hazards Chapter).</li> </ul> <p>Note – for changes to the MRZ chapter, refer to the annotated version of the chapter that is included with the submission.</p>	Accept in part.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.105	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission, noting that inundation areas are managed by other rules so therefore do not necessarily need to be included as qualifying matters.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.33	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Opposes MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) at 395 Middleton Road in Upper Stebbings and Glenside West development zone.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Opposes Medium Density Residential Zone in the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Future Development Zone (specifically at 395 Middleton Road).	Reject.	No.
Priscilla Williams	293.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Considers that the spatial area coverage (Medium Density Residential Zoning) to Kinross Street in the PDP is appropriate.	Retain the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) zoning at Kinross Street as notified.	Accept.	No.
Johanna Carter	296.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Opposes the MRZ objectives, policies and standards	Opposes Medium Density Residential zone chapter as notified.	Reject.	No.
Johanna Carter	296.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the proposed outlook provisions do not appear to achieve privacy and in some instances will have adjoining neighbours looking directly at each other with very little separation between properties.	Seeks addition of a new provision in the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter to add a parking standard requirement for new units where there is insufficient available on road parking.	Reject.	No.
Johanna Carter	296.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the simplistic notion that getting rid of parking will discourage private vehicle use is short sighted and not justified and without adequate provision for some parking per site will generate adverse effects – such as impeding traffic flow especially for emergency vehicles, creating pedestrian hazards as well as generating unsightly negative visual effects.  Not all streets in Wellington have sufficient on street parking available so encouraging some off-street parking seems prudent.	Seeks the addition of a new provision in the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter to add a requirement that sites accommodate some parking to cater for people with disabilities and families not able to use public transport and for those where public transport is erratic.  [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Johanna Carter	296.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that there is no reason why the multi-unit rules have lesser standards of privacy outlook and open space.	Seeks that provisions relating to outlooks in multi-unit developments need further refinement and investigation to better control the adverse effects such developments will generate.	Reject.	No.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.25	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Opposes changing zoning of part of the Tapu te Ranga marae site at 44 Rhine Street, Island Bay from NOSZ to MRZ.  Submitter acknowledges their original request for increased residential zoning in the PDP, they would like to amend the extent of residential zoning within the PDP to reflect the original residential and open space zoning in the operative district plan. This is to reflect the aspirations the submitter has for the site in the next 10-15 years. At this stage, the Trust do not have the resources to comprehensively address contamination and geotechnical issues, so would like to revert to the zoning shown in the operative district plan (changing additional Medium Residential Zone back to Open Space).	Seeks that land at 44 Rhine Street, Island Bay that has been rezoned Medium Density Residential Zone from Natural Open Space Zone, be rezoned back to Natural Open Space Zone.	Reject.	No.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.26	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Supports the specific reference to Tapu-te-Ranga requiring specific policies to manage opportunities on their site.	Retain introduction of Medium Density Residential Zone as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Considers that the revised recession plane (height in relation to boundary) provisions introduced by the MDRS and the adoption of the MRZ removes the chance for sunlight, while also reducing adequate daylight, and that design guidance on this would improve built outcomes.	Seeks amendments to the design guides to address sunlight/daylight access.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.221	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, which seeks for retirement villages to be excluded from the application of the Design Guides.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.221	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which seeks for retirement villages to be excluded from the application of the Design Guides.	Disallow	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers the need for a Design Review Panels for 3 x3 developments in MDRZ where developments are over 3 levels. The wholesale adoption of the MDRS standards could well result in a drastic lowering of design standards of housing, given that there are no quality control standards applied at the same time. A solution would be a mandatory Design Panel Review, as it would encourage high quality design outcomes in the city.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that a mandatory Design Panel Review be adopted for all 3x3 Medium Density Residential Zone developments.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.222	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission and with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD, in that it will slow, not speed up intensification.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.222	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD, in that it will slow, not speed up intensification.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.36	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose in part	Considers that MRZ standards should be amended to require cycle and micromobility parking and charging for residents that is sufficient to meet future demand aligned with 80% of people making some trips per week by cycle. Multi-unit housing should provide adequate and appropriately located cycle and micromobility parking that meets the standards set out in the Transport chapter of the PDP.	Opposes standards in the 'Medium Density Residential Zone' chapter and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.198	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	The RVA does not oppose these submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, The RVA considers that the changes sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages form the application of the new provisions.	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.198	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Ryman does not oppose these submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, Ryman considers that the changes sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages form the application of the new provisions.	Reject.	No.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.37	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that MRZ standards should be amended to require cycle and micromobility parking and charging for residents that is sufficient to meet future demand aligned with 80% of people making some trips per week by cycle. Multi-unit housing should provide adequate and appropriately located cycle and micromobility parking that meets the standards set out in the Transport chapter of the PDP.	Amend standards in the 'Medium Density Residential Zone' chapter to require cycle and micromobility parking and charging for residents that is sufficient to meet future demand aligned with 80% of people making some trips per week by cycle.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.199	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	The RVA does not oppose these submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, The RVA considers that the changes sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages form the application of the new provisions.	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.199	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Ryman does not oppose these submission point in principle, but due to the age and frequency of mobility constraints amongst retirement village residents, Ryman considers that the changes sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Allow submission points, subject to excluding retirement villages form the application of the new provisions.	Reject.	No.
Roland Sapsford	305.31	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the District Plan should better identify and protect areas of existing green space from partial or complete loss within Medium Density Residential Zones.	Seeks that the District Plan be amended to better identify and protect areas of existing green space from partial or complete loss within Medium Density Residential Zones.	Reject.	No.
Roland Sapsford	305.32	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that six-storey buildings should not be allowed on Adams Terrace. Most of Aro Street, as well as Adams Terrace and lower Durham Street, are zoned for at least six storeys, with the exception of some heritage-listed buildings.  While six storeys may be appropriate for structures tucked into the escarpment below Landcross Street or Durham Street, one poorly-placed building fronting Aro Street could have catastrophic effects on winter sunlight for many dwellings, including a large amount of recent infill housing.	Retain Adams Terrace as Medium Density Residential Zone.  [Inferred decision requested]	Accept	No.
Roland Sapsford	305.33	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to the Medium Density Residential area need modification so as to provide a far more nuanced and careful consideration of issues such as light, shading, wind, privacy, design quality, retention of green areas, character and heritage.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to provide more careful consideration to issues such as light, shading, wind, privacy, design quality, retention of green areas, character and heritage.	Reject.	No.
Roland Sapsford	305.34	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to Medium Density Residential area need modification so as to provide for enhanced sunlight access to outdoor and indoor living areas, the addition and extension of new green space to balance increased residential densities, and take a more sophisticated and nuanced approach to design guidance.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to provide for enhanced sunlight access to outdoor and indoor living areas, the addition and extension of new green space to balance increased residential densities, and take a more sophisticated and nuanced approach to design guidance.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Roland Sapsford	305.35	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that Palmer Street should not be surrounded on four sides by buildings with permitted heights of six storeys and eight storeys. Palmer Street is identified in the Proposed Plan as a "character precinct" with an 11m height limit for new buildings. Palmer Street already experiences significant shading from the existing high rise located between Palmer and Abel Smith Streets.	Seeks that Palmer Street not be surrounded on four sides by buildings with permitted heights of six storeys and eight storeys.  [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part	Yes.
Roland Sapsford	305.36	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to Medium Density Residential area need modification so as to retain the capacity within Aro Valley for site-by-site consideration of each development by ensuring that most developments triggers the need for a resource consent, as is currently the case.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to require resource consents for new developments in Aro Valley.	Reject.	No.
Roland Sapsford	305.37	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to Medium Density Residential area need modification so as to develop location specific design guides and relevant standards to enable a more granular approach to local character. Standards should include access to sunlight and shade, the maintenance of personal privacy, the variety and location of green spaces, the location and scale of exterior space and development, the control of heat island effects and the look and feel of the streets we inhabit.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to include location specific design guides and standards to enable a more granular approach to local character.	Reject.	No.
Roland Sapsford	305.38	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone standards for height limit, site coverage, height in relation to boundary and side and rear yard setbacks so as to require resource consents where new developments have a more than minor impact on local character, sunlight, shading and outdoor recreation space.	Reject.	No.
Roland Sapsford	305.39	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to require resource consents related to the location of buildings on sites and issues of personal privacy and shading within and between multiple developments on a single site so to enable management of these design quality issues.	Reject.	No.
Roland Sapsford	305.40	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the objectives and rules relating to Medium Density Residential area need modification so as to retain existing provisions relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan rather than replace them with the minimum daylight provisions of the proposed Plan.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to retain existing provisions relating to minimum sunlight in the Operative Plan.	Reject.	No.
Roland Sapsford	305.41	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to identify underutilised sites and locations within Aro Valley that are not subject to demolition controls and are suitable for intensification within the existing character areas (as defined in the Operative Plan).	Reject.	No.
Roland Sapsford	305.42	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter be amended to identify sites and areas within Aro Valley where more intensive development could occur without adverse effects on sunlight, privacy, heritage and local character.	Reject.	No.
Roland Sapsford	305.43	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that objectives and rules relating to the MRZ as they relate to Aro Valley should clearly identify community-based planning for intensification as a method for increasing housing supply within areas subject to the revised demolition controls set out above, and provide for this planning to occur so as to be complete prior to significant infrastructure investment.	Seeks that community-based planning be identified prior to infrastructure investments in the Medium Density Residential chapter.	Reject.	No.
James Coyle	307.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that carparking be minimised and accessed via rear lots or lanes.	Reject.	No.
James Coyle	307.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that tree canopy and soil be prioritised over concrete and carparks.	Reject.	No.
Svend Heeselohlt Henne Hansen	308.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative MDRS recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.
Svend Heeselohlt Henne Hansen	308.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in centres.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.21	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Considers submissions are inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements; and no justification for enabling more intensive development in the MDRZ or around rail stations.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Philip O'Reilly and Julie Saddington	310.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that there is a lack of policy and standards managing the transition between areas that have a 21m maximum height and adjacent character areas, with the 11m height.  Considers that this will lead to the character areas being boxed in and reduce amenity in these areas.	Seeks an appropriate transition zone adjacent to character areas. [Inferred decision sought]	Accept in part	Yes.
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (MRZ) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.	Addressed in Report 4B	
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.178	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that in accordance with s771 and s770 of the RMA, the National Grid is a qualifying matter.  Considers amendment should be made in introductory text to specifically reference the National Grid as a qualifying matter. Considers this would be consistent with the approach of listing other matters.	Amend the introduction as follows:  There are parts of the Medium Density Residential Zone where the permitted development, height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified <u>and/or</u> limited by qualifying matters. <u>Each activity shall comply with the relevant qualifying matter area provisions and permitted activity standards of the Plan as listed below. These include the following:—</u>  - Character Precincts and the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct (refer to MRZ-PREC01 and MRZ-PREC02). - ..... - The National Grid Yard and National Grid Subdivision Corridor provisions.	Reject.	No.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.179	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that in accordance with s771 and s770 of the RMA, the National Grid is a qualifying matter.  An amendment to the introduction is sought to clarify that the list is exhaustive, thereby providing certainty to plan users as to what qualifying matters apply.	Clarify in the introduction to the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter that the list of qualifying matters is exhaustive.	Reject.	No.
Hilary Watson	321.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that demolishing wooden houses is not ecologically sound and would strip Wellington of its character. There are very few wooden cities in the world. Totara is unique to Aotearoa, it's a Taonga, and it's green. Wooden houses can be insulated, made earthquake-safe and resilient using ecologically sound materials. Demolition will emit CO2, as will concrete from new builds. Newtown's wooden houses have lasted from back as far as 1890 and will last another 142 years at least. Furthermore, new builds require cement, which is the source of about 8% of the world carbon dioxide emissions.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that wooden houses be preserved rather than demolished. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Khoi Phan	326.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Considers Ngaio should be classified as Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain Ngaio as Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept.	No.
Khoi Phan	326.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Considers Khandallah should be classified as Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain Khandallah as Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept.	No.
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that multi-unit dwellings are an important aspect of Mt Cook and should have strong environmental and sustainable living provisions. In particular, the impacts of living more sustainably in apartments needs to incorporate provision for waste management such as composting, emergency provisions such as water storage, and access to green spaces and common areas for wellbeing, mental health and dog-walking. Rooftop gardens, pocket parks, well-designed foyers and hallways provide spaces for informal interaction which are important for living well together in an apartment community.	Seeks that provisions on sustainable living be created for multi-unit dwellings in Mount Cook.	Reject.	No.
Yvonne Weeber	340.104	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the MRZ chapter needs clarification. The MRZ chapter should be amended to include cross references to qualifying matters in the rules to make the plan easier to understand their implications e.g. the Air Noise Overlay (Inner Air Noise Overlay and Outer Air Noise Overlay).	Amend the 'Medium Density Residential Zone' chapter to reference all qualifying matters in its rules.	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.97	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support in part	Paragraph 1 of the introduction refers to the zone comprising of 'predominantly residential activities with a moderate concentration and bulk of buildings...'. Considers that 'moderate concentration' is an ambiguous term that is not defined elsewhere in the District Plan, meaning the Introduction as currently drafted does not clearly identify the anticipated concentration of buildings in the MDR Zone. Also considers that the reference to residential activity having a moderate concentration and bulk of buildings does not reflect the expectations for the Medium Density Residential Zone as set out in the MDRS. Seeks that the introductory text acknowledge that the amenity and character of the Medium Density Residential Zone will substantially change as a result of the MDRS and acknowledge the broad scope of the MRZ.	Retain Paragraph 1 of the Introduction of the Medium Density Residential Zone and seeks amendment.	Accept in part.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.98	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Paragraph 1 of the introduction refers to the zone comprising of 'predominantly residential activities with a moderate concentration and bulk of buildings...'. Considers that 'moderate concentration' is an ambiguous term that is not defined elsewhere in the District Plan, meaning the Introduction as currently drafted does not clearly identify the anticipated concentration of buildings in the MDR Zone. Also considers that the reference to residential activity having a moderate concentration and bulk of buildings does not reflect the expectations for the Medium Density Residential Zone as set out in the MDRS. Seeks that the introductory text acknowledge that the amenity and character of the Medium Density Residential Zone will substantially change as a result of the MDRS and acknowledge the broad scope of the MRZ.	Amend Paragraph 1 of the Introduction of the Medium Density Residential Zone as follows: The Medium Density Residential Zone comprises predominantly residential activities that enable more intensive development including medium density development that typically comprises with a moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, such as detached, semi-detached and terraced housing, low-rise apartments and other compatible activities.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.99	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support in part	Supports that Paragraph 5 of the introduction recognises that the form, appearance and amenity of neighbourhoods within the MRZ Zone will change over time, in line with Objective 4 NPSUD. However, considers that as it is currently drafted, it does not acknowledge that such changes will enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities in the zone, as required by Objective 2 MDRS.	Retain Paragraph 2 of the Introduction of the Medium Density Residential Zone and seeks amendment.	Accept.	Yes.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.100	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports that Paragraph 5 of the introduction recognises that the form, appearance and amenity of neighbourhoods within the MRZ Zone will change over time, in line with Objective 4 NPSUD. However, considers that as it is currently drafted, it does not acknowledge that such changes will enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities in the zone, as required by Objective 2 MDRS.	Amend Paragraph 2 of the Introduction of the Medium Density Residential Zone as follows: It is anticipated that the form, appearance and amenity of neighbourhoods within the Medium Density Residential Zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.	Accept.	Yes.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.248	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support in part	Supports well-planned intensification within the existing urban footprint in appropriate areas that are not subject to a qualifying matter. This approach is consistent with Policy 31 of Proposed RPS Change 1.	Retain chapter, subject to amendments, as outlined in other submission points.	Reject.	No.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.21	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Ensure that the provisions align with Objective 22 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.249	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that for the provisions of the zone to contribute to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1. This includes (but is not limited to) urban areas that are climate resilient, contribute to the protection of the natural environment and transition to a low-emission region, are compact and well connected, support housing affordability and choice, and enable Māori to express their cultural and traditional norms.	Seeks to ensure the Medium Density Residential Zone provisions have regard to the qualities and characteristics of well-functioning urban environments as articulated in Objective 22 of Proposed RPS Change 1, by including necessary objectives, policies, permitted standards and rules that provide for these qualities and characteristics.	Accept in part.	No.
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.22	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Ensure that the provisions align with Objective 22 of the Proposed RPS Change 1.	Allow	Accept in part.	No.
Lower Kelburn Neighbourhood Group	356.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that Lower Kelburn should have more character Precincts. [Inferred reason - refer to original submission]	Rezone Lower Kelburn from High Density Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part.	Yes.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.90	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support in part	The MRZ chapter is partially supported, granted MRZ-P6 (Multi unit housing) is amended to require consideration of reverse sensitivity effects. This policies i a matter of discretion for multi-unit housing (i.e. more than 3 dwellings per site) in the MRZ.	Retain the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.153	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought relating to recognition of reverse sensitivity in policies and matters of discretion in order to maximise residential intensification.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the MRZ objectives and policies relating to housing supply need to allow for public and private collaborations and inducements. The submitter notes that if left to their own devices (and profit goals) and without a change in the current offerings, it is difficult to anticipate the majority of developers unilaterally offering the range and variety of housing at an appropriate price point to meet the actual demands of Wellington home buyers and renters. Public and private collaborations and inducements will achieve the goal of future development increasing housing choice and affordability, including assisted living and social housing.	Seeks that MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) objectives relating to housing supply allow for public and private collaborations and inducements.	Reject.	No.
Jane Szentivanyi and Ben Briggs	369.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that MRZ and Design guide standards must ensure that scale and intensity requirements for new builds or additions are consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the zone. This means that the impact of the increased development on the amenity value of neighbouring properties needs to be considered as required by guideline 21 from the Residential Design Guide.	Seeks that MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and Residential Design Guide standards ensure scale and intensity requirements for new builds or additions are consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the zone.	Accept in part.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.262	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Support higher densities being enabled in the medium density residential zone. Considers that the precinct would be more appropriate as an overlay, and/or the area rezoned to high density residential zone.	Seeks Oriental Bay Height Precinct is amended to be an overlay. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.264	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that all boundary setbacks should have immediate legal effect to align with the MDRS requirements, and to avoid confusion where boundary setbacks are applied from both the operative and district plan. Notes that the intention of the NPS-UD is to enable urban environments to evolve and change, enabled by the national standards.	Seeks that all that relate to MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) have immediate legal effect. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part.	No.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.108	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support in part	The MRZ chapter is generally supported. As it stands, the PDP will enable the construction and use of three dwellings on most residential properties, with a maximum height of 11m and more permissive building recession planes, as a permitted activity. In addition, resource consents may be obtained as a restricted discretionary activity to construct buildings up to 25m in height with no limit to the number of residential units (i.e.: density). The Fuel Companies consider these greater residential densities and more permissive building standards are likely to generate greater potential for reverse sensitivity effects that may affect the ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade of their facilities which are a physical resource that must be managed under the Act.	Not specified.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.47	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought due to potential impacts on the scale of residential intensification.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations.	Reject.	No.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as day-cares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what's proposed.	Reject.	No.



Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Stephen Minto	FS100.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter 234 wants to reduce shading as an issue when designing a development. But if people have solar panels on their house then this is an ongoing financial benefit that is lost. Compensation has not been considered or discussed in the submission. The criticality of sunlight to well being. It should be a right to have it in your house. It is known to help house sales so it has a value and the submitters place no value on it.</p> <p>Appreciates the submitter wants more houses and assumes they want affordable housing. Instead wants affordable housing and sees densification as having merits in the right places. Like in the brownfields of Te Aro. Not by ripping the heart out of our heritage/ character suburbs. Our heritage/chaacter suburbs are a finite asset that is special to NZ. Tourists talk about it being special and different. Our heritage is part of continuity with our past. And being connected to the past is a critical part of becoming aware of our identity as New Zealanders. Heritage gives us a sense of place. Our place. Try getting Parisians to pull down the Eiffel Tower now.</p> <p>Heritage buildings and character areas connect to the trees that covered our land and were destroyed. Respecting heritage houses gives us a chance to still see the beauty of their wood. The trees that are special to NZ. The Rimu reds, the various stains, the hardness of Matai. The connection to what makes NZ. So when we plant and replace it will mean a deeper understanding of the beauty that was destroyed. Protecting heritage therefore helps connect us to a better future and an awareness that we should not let that destruction happen again.</p> <p>Wellington has already lost most of its character and heritage from the central city. Lambton Quay destroyed but its no safer from earthquakes in fact less safe. Heritage and character just aren't looked after so they often are poor quality. Requiring them to be done up to an excellent standard would be cheaper and less carbon intensive than building new. Note: Cities can shape well being and happiness as well. They aren't just cost effective rooms to sleep in. [Inferred reference to submission point 234.7]</p>	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.92	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that the proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST is amended from Natural Open Space Zone to Medium Density Residential with a 'Te Motu Kairangi Precinct' with associated objectives, policies, rules and standards to recognise the cultural and environmental overlays over the site whilst enabling Taranaki Whānui to exercise their customary responsibilities as kaitiaki, and to undertake development that supports their cultural, social and economic wellbeing.	Reject.	No.
Laurence Harger & Ingrid Kölle	FS2.29	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Taranaki Whanui's proposal would seem to allow another large and obtrusive development on the prison site, à la Shelly Bay, by sale of the land, if acquired under the right of first refusal, to a commercial developer.</p> <p>Support Papakāinga development that keeps to the 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops, as long as native trees and vegetation are protected. Such a housing development should also be compatible with the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park. The local community, the wider Wellington community and all iwi groups should be involved in any decisions made.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the part of the submission that could open up the Mount Crawford site to large-scale commercial housing development be disallowed.	Accept in part.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.14	Part 3 / Residential Zones/ Medium Density Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>It is clear Taranaki Whānui want all restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear based on the submission exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan, both the Corrections and Defence Land have not in the past contested this zoning and the Proposed District Plan keeps Watts Peninsula as open Space, the Ridgelines and Hilltops add to significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) it has a Special Amenity Landscape which is used by the community and tourists to the enjoyment of being close to a city but with a natural environment.</p> <p>Taranaki Whānui are seeking to amend the zoning in this area to Medium Density Residential or to a Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone, without any public engagement. Such changes would have a significant impact on the local community and should not be undertaken without wider consultation and engagement in order to ensure that proposed changes do not have a detrimental effect. As noted above, it is of concern to the businesses, community (ratepayers) of Te Motu Kairangi/Miramar Peninsula and the wider public that the rezoning applied for by Taranaki Whānui (currently open space) to develop a papakainga creates infrastructure issues on an already overloaded roading, flooding and transport links to and from the Peninsula.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission 389.92].</p>	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Mary Varnham and Paul O'Regan	FS40.29	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>The submission by Taranaki Whānui is not specific on this matter but seems to imply that the site be open for medium density housing development. We would support proposals for papakainga on the site provided 11-12 m height limits and rules restricting building on ridgelines and hilltops are observed. Buildings should not be visible from the harbour and native trees and vegetation should be protected and regenerated. Access should be restricted to existing roads; no road access should be allowed from Shelly Bay or adjacent hillsides.</p> <p>Disallow any provisions which would allow the Mount Crawford site to be sold to a commercial property developer (as happened at Shelly Bay) and current provisions regarding height limits, ridgelines and hilltops to be removed. Any housing development should be compatible with and sympathetic to the values of the adjacent reserve/National Heritage Park proposed for Watts Peninsula, and the local community should be involved in all decision making.</p>	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Buy Back the Bay	FS79.34	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submission 389 states: "Taranaki Whānui's RFR [Right of First Refusal] opportunities in Te Motu Kairangi: Taranaki Whānui have a significant interest in Te Motu Kairangi which includes Mount Crawford and Watts Peninsula, these landholdings hold significant interest - culturally, socially, environmentally and commercially to Taranaki Whānui. These opportunities include the Mount Crawford Prison site as well as the 'Watts Peninsula' sites being 75.85 hectares of former Defence Land."</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays notes that the Submission does not include maps however they (Buy Back the Bays) are very concerned to see that Taranaki Whānui appears to be seeking possible commercial development of 75.85 hectares of former defence land on Watts Peninsula. This appears to be the heart of the long-promised Watts Peninsula park and a major part of the proposed national heritage park.</p> <p>Buy Back the Bays strongly oppose rezoning on Watts Peninsula to facilitate any development there that is incompatible with the park plans. More generally, Buy Back the Bays oppose Submission 389's attempt to remove the proposed public interest controls from Watts Peninsula and Mount Crawford. Considers that where Submission 389 states "Illustrated on Figure One below, the following zone and overlays are proposed for Taranaki Whānui's RFR properties in Te Motu Kairangi," Buy Back the Bays oppose the changes it seeks.</p> <p>This includes opposing Submission 389's request for "The proposed zoning over Part Lot 1 DP 4741, Section 4 SO 477035, PT LOT 1 DP 4741 - WELLINGTON PRISON, Section 1 SO 477035, Part Section 20 Watts Peninsula DIST [to be] amended from Natural Open Space Zone to: a. Medium Density Residential; and b. Special Purpose Zone – Māori Purpose Zone."</p>	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lance Lones	FS81.19	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Te Motu Kairangi is very nearly an island, and as a result of the amazing work of Predator Free Wellington, is in fact, nearly predator free, and uniquely able to support significant biodiversity. Combined with the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay, and the Significant Natural Areas overlay of this space, all citizens of both Wellington, and Aotearoa in general have an incredibly singular opportunity to support the development of native flora and fauna in one nearly contiguous environment, a situation which is unique within Wellington. Attests to the incredible return of many native species of birds to this area, from kererū, to flocks of piwakawaka and tūi, kārearea hunting on the hillsides and heard ruru calling in the evenings and mornings.</p> <p>To remove the Open Space zoning, Significant Natural Areas and Special Amenity Landscape overlays for a significant portion of this habitat would put these species at risk once again.</p> <p>Presents a unique opportunity to implement the Ministry for the Environment's Proposed National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity. This policy progressively refers to the concept of Te Rito o te Harakeke.</p> <p>The local community has expressed the desire to work with and develop a master plan for the Watts Peninsula, but this voice has been repeatedly denied by council. Removing the protections put in place by the proposed district plan would once again disempower the greater community with no discussion.</p> <p>[Refer to further submission for full reason]</p>	Disallow / Seeks that the current zoning and overlays as presented in the Proposed District Plan for the northern sections of Te Motu Kairangi / Miramar Peninsula be retained. In particular, that the Open Space zoning, Special Amenity Landscape, Natural Areas, and Ridgelines and Hilltops overlays are retained.	Accept in part.	No.
Andy Foster	FS86.20	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>The submission from Taranaki Whanui if accepted would remove all protections, many of them long standing and uncontested for decades, from Te Motu Kairangi / Watts Peninsula and make community involvement much less likely, and limit the need for community involvement. On these basis the submitter opposes Taranaki Whanui's submission.</p> <p>Watts Peninsula is currently zoned Open Space B in the Operative (current) District Plan. It has been Open Space B for at least the last 30 years, and nobody has ever contested this. That includes both the Corrections and Defence Land.</p> <p>The Proposed District Plan keeps Watts as Open Space and within the Ridgelines and Hilltops Overlay. It also adds Significant Natural Areas (for biodiversity) and a Special Amenity Landscape (because of its high level of landscape importance) All of these are based on good evidence.</p> <p>Taranaki Whanui want all of those restrictions removed, and the Corrections land at least rezoned for medium density housing. It is unclear exactly how large an area they want to have rezoned.</p> <p>Taranaki Whanui's request to remove the Open Space zoning which has been in place, uncontested by the owners, for at least 30 years. The current Open Space B zoning does not anticipate any built development and therefore there is no legal or reasonable expectation that there should be any development here.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 389.92]</p>	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.311	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that MRZ heights in walkable catchments of Local Centre Zones should be amended.	Seeks that Medium Density Residential Zone heights be increased by up to 5 storeys within 5 min/400m walkable catchments of Local Centre Zones.	Reject.	No.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter opposes Medium Density Residential Standards' heights to increase by 5 stories with 5 mins/ 400 meters of Local Centre Zone.</p> <p>Considers that this is beyond the scope of National Policy Statement on Urban Development / Medium Density Residential Standards.</p>	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.13	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Considers 5-storey intensification in and near Local Centre Zones is too extensive and inappropriate and goes beyond the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Medium Density Residential Standards.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.64	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Considers that 5-storey intensification in and near Local Centre Zones is too extensive and inappropriate and goes beyond the requirements of the NPS-UD and MDRS.	Disallow	Accept.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.30	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Accept in part.	No.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.17	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Increasing medium density residential zone heights to 5 storeys within a 5 min catchment of local centre zones is opposed. This would make them high density and this is a radical change that has not been widely socialized. 5-storey intensification in and near Local Centre Zones is too extensive and inappropriate and goes beyond the requirements of the NPS-UD and MDRS.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.16	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Increasing medium density residential zone heights to 5 storeys within a 5 min catchment of local centre zones is opposed. This would make them high density and this is a radical change that has not been widely socialized. 5-storey intensification in and near Local Centre Zones is too extensive and inappropriate and goes beyond the requirements of the NPS-UD and MDRS.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.312	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that amendments to centres and height limits would achieve well-functioning urban environments and national and regional consistency.	Seeks to expand the geographical extent of centres and height limits, to better reflect their role and function in the Centres hierarchy.	Reject.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.31	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.313	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose in part	The Introduction to the MRZ is generally supported, in particular the provision of medium density housing to give effect to the NPS-UD and the Act. But amendments are sought relating to the introduction of Character Precincts and different provisions related to the construction of 4 or more residential units. Instead, it is sought that a Character Overlay is introduced into District-wide matters.	Opposes the Introduction of the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.12	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	The WCC summary reads: <i>The Introduction to the MRZ is generally supported, in particular the provision of medium density housing to give effect to the NPS-UD and the Act. But amendments are sought relating to the introduction of Character Precincts and different provisions related to the construction of 4 or more residential units. Instead, it is sought that a Character Overlay is introduced into District-wide matters.</i>  Special character precincts enable rigorous, targeted, sustainable urban planning regulation, and a role for community engagement in future changes.  TRA specifically oppose 391.318 which seeks to delete Objective UFD-08 and rejects its recognition of "special character" at the strategic level of the Plan.  The TRA supports Character precincts because they comply with the NPS-UD, and are an important qualifying matter under the RMA.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.314	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the Introduction of the MRZ chapter should be amended to make it clear that incompatible activities in the MRZ will be managed or discouraged in line with a Discretionary / Non-Complying activity status. Character Precincts, Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct or Oriental Bay Precinct should be removed from the introduction. These precincts do not fulfil the matters of national importance as set out under section 6(f) and the requirements under section 77L and 77R of the RMA, and therefore do not meet the threshold to be applied as a qualifying matter to restrict height and density.  It is also considered that 4 or more dwellings should not be classified as a different activity as the potential, or actual effects of residential development should not be distinguished between building 3 and 4 (or more) residential units.	Amend the Introduction of the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter as follows: ... The Medium Density Residential Zone adopts the medium density residential standards from the RMA which allow for three residential units of up to three storeys on a site. <u>Developments of four or more residential units are also encouraged through the policy framework and provided for through a resource consent process. Multi-unit housing of four or more units is also anticipated through a resource consent process subject to standards and design guidance.</u>  There are parts of the Medium Density Residential Zone where the permitted development, height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters. These include the following:  <del>Character Precincts and the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct (refer to MRZ-PRC01 and MRZ-PRC02).</del> ... The Medium Density Residential Zone accommodates a range of compatible non-residential uses that support the needs of local communities. Incompatible non-residential activities are not anticipated managed or discouraged in this zone.  <del>Precincts within the Medium Density Residential Zone include Character Precincts, the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct, and the Oriental Bay Height Precinct.</del>	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ann Mallinson	FS3.1	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	The review or elimination of MRZ-PREC-03 and policies and rules and standards relating to the Oriental Bay Height Precinct are opposed. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responded to the judgment in the submitter's successful legal case D Rendel, A Mallinson & others v Wellington City Council Decision No. W73/98 and provides protection for significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character in Oriental Bay. Refer to original submission 81 (points 81.3 and 81.4).	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Jackie Pope	FS8.1	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is extremely important to maintain important townscape and landscape values, and protects public views of Mt Victoria/Matairangi and St Gerards heritage site, and also supports the unique character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Denis Foot	FS10.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	The matters of the heights density and planning issues in Oriental Bay were the subject of a very expensive three week hearing at the Environment Court. The case was called Foot v WCC. In that case there were many lawyers, planners, urban designers, architects and residents that gave their views. Judge Kenderdine gave a very carefully considered judgement covering the various areas in Oriental Bay. The decision takes into account the diverse landforms which includes several valleys. There are still many areas in the Oriental Bay area where it is possible to build multi-storey apartments.  [Inferred reference to submission point 391.314]	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Oriental Bay Residents Association	FS13.1	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Ruapapa Limited	FS18.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay. The principles set out in the Environment Court decision in Foot v WCC should remain in place.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Scott Galloway and Carolyn McLean	FS19.1	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.7	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill.  Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Oppose removal of reference to Character Precincts and Mt Victoria North Townscape from the introduction because it is important to make it clear that these are qualifying matters.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Jenny Gyles	FS53.1	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Considers that the Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Helen Foot	FS62.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is extremely important to maintain important townscape and landscape values, and protects public views of Mt Victoria/Matairangi and St Gerards heritage site, and also supports the unique character of Oriental Bay. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct and in particular that part of it adjacent to Hay Street and Grass Street was the subject of a very careful review in the decision of the Environment Court in 1989 (Helen Foot and others v WCC Decision W79/98). There is nothing to be gained by seeking a review of this decision.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.132	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Considers the signalled direction in the introduction would be more enabling than MDRS requirements without adequate justification.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Don MacKay	FS94.7	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay).Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations.	Reject.	No.
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the MRZ is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.
Generation Zero	FS54.1	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Support and further submit that: The Coalition for More Homes setback, recession planes and outdoor space recommendations should be adopted. These recommendations enable perimeter block housing rather than only enabling 'sausage flat' housing, due to New Zealand's typical long, narrow sites. This leads to better urban design outcomes that maximise quality habitable indoor and outdoor space for residents, minimise shading and privacy impacts for neighbours, and produces housing that positively interacts with the street frontage.	Allow / Seeks the adoption of the Coalition for More Homes set-back, recession planes and outdoor space recommendations for the MRZ and HRZ zones.  Seeks the adoption of more mixed-use zoning in all zones, especially the MRZ and HRZ zones.	Reject.	No.
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as day-cares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.
Generation Zero	FS54.2	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Support and further submit that: More mixed-use zoning should be adopted in all residential zones, especially in MDZ and HDZ. The PDP focuses on enabling more residential development but lacks enabling commercial development outside the CCZ. Low impact uses like daycares, cafes, physios, doctor's offices, small retail should be enabled. This can especially be enabled on corner sites and near existing town centres and villages, and in walkable catchments. Mixed-use zoning is essential for well-functioning urban environments. It has numerous benefits including: increased ability for new shops to cater for new residents and WFH habits, lower transport needs, more freedom for children and elderly, more competitive commercial rents, vibrant community villages, spillover safety benefits. Pre1930s suburbs have significant 'grandfathered' mixed use zoning, before modern zoning was introduced. These provide significant local amenity to residents, reflected in the high prices and increased liveability of those suburbs. Low impact commercial uses have little negative externalities (these can be managed via existing PDP noise, shading, opening hour, etc provisions) and significant positive externalities. More mixed-used zoning is consistent with Objectives 1, 3, 4 and 8 of the NPS-UD. And policies 1, 2. Council is rightly planning for growth by enabling residential housing supply, it must also enable neighborhood mixed-used zoning to cater for that growth.	Allow / Seeks the adoption of the Coalition for More Homes set-back, recession planes and outdoor space recommendations for the MRZ and HRZ zones.  Seeks the adoption of more mixed-use zoning in all zones, especially the MRZ and HRZ zones.	Reject.	No.
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what's proposed.	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Stephen Minto	FS100.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter 234 wants to reduce shading as an issue when designing a development. But if people have solar panels on their house then this is an ongoing financial benefit that is lost. Compensation has not been considered or discussed in the submission. The criticality of sunlight to well being. It should be a right to have it in your house. It is known to help house sales so it has a value and the submitters place no value on it.</p> <p>Appreciates the submitter wants more houses and assumes they want affordable housing. Instead wants affordable housing and sees densification as having merits in the right places. Like in the brownfields of Te Aro. Not by ripping the heart out of our heritage/ character suburbs. Our heritage/character suburbs are a finite asset that is special to NZ. Tourists talk about it being special and different. Our heritage is part of continuity with our past. And being connected to the past is a critical part of becoming aware of our identity as New Zealanders. Heritage gives us a sense of place. Our place. Try getting Parisians to pull down the Eiffel Tower now.</p> <p>Heritage buildings and character areas connect to the trees that covered our land and were destroyed. Respecting heritage houses gives us a chance to still see the beauty of their wood. The trees that are special to NZ. The Rimu reds, the various stains, the hardness of Matai. The connection to what makes NZ. So when we plant and replace it will mean a deeper understanding of the beauty that was destroyed. Protecting heritage therefore helps connect us to a better future and an awareness that we should not let that destruction happen again.</p> <p>Wellington has already lost most of its character and heritage from the central city. Lambton Quay destroyed but its no safer from earthquakes in fact less safe. Heritage and character just aren't looked after so they often are poor quality. Requiring them to be done up to an excellent standard would be cheaper and less carbon intensive than building new. Note: Cities can shape well being and happiness as well. They aren't just cost effective rooms to sleep in. [Inferred reference to submission point 234.7]</p>	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
David Cadman	398.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations.	Reject.	No.
David Cadman	398.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the MRZ is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.
David Cadman	398.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as day-cares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.
David Cadman	398.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what's proposed.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.28	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>The WCC Summary reads: The submission seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what's proposed. Shading impacts are a considerable issue. Shading can impact the use, enjoyment, amenity, and thermal performance of wooden and other dwellings originally built with solar advantages assumed on their sites.</p> <p>TRA are mindful that the greenest buildings are those timber buildings that are already built. There's an accumulative benefit from our older native timber buildings. They have low carbon emissions instead of constructing new buildings using materials (such as concrete and steel) with significant whole of life carbon emissions.</p>	Disallow	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Stephen Minto	FS100.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter 234 wants to reduce shading as an issue when designing a development. But if people have solar panels on their house then this is an ongoing financial benefit that is lost. Compensation has not been considered or discussed in the submission. The criticality of sunlight to well being. It should be a right to have it in your house. It is known to help house sales so it has a value and the submitters place no value on it.</p> <p>Appreciates the submitter wants more houses and assumes they want affordable housing. Instead wants affordable housing and sees densification as having merits in the right places. Like in the brownfields of Te Aro. Not by ripping the heart out of our heritage/ character suburbs. Our heritage/chaacter suburbs are a finite asset that is special to NZ. Tourists talk about it being special and different. Our heritage is part of continuity with our past. And being connected to the past is a critical part of becoming aware of our identity as New Zealanders. Heritage gives us a sense of place. Our place. Try getting Parisians to pull down the Eiffel Tower now.</p> <p>Heritage buildings and character areas connect to the trees that covered our land and were destroyed. Respecting heritage houses gives us a chance to still see the beauty of their wood. The trees that are special to NZ. The Rimu reds, the various stains, the hardness of Matai. The connection to what makes NZ. So when we plant and replace it will mean a deeper understanding of the beauty that was destroyed. Protecting heritage therefore helps connect us to a better future and an awareness that we should not let that destruction happen again.</p> <p>Wellington has already lost most of its character and heritage from the central city. Lambton Quay destroyed but its no safer from earthquakes in fact less safe. Heritage and character just aren't looked after so they often are poor quality. Requiring them to be done up to an excellent standard would be cheaper and less carbon intensive than building new. Note: Cities can shape well being and happiness as well. They aren't just cost effective rooms to sleep in. [Inferred reference to submission point 234.7]</p>	Disallow		
Guy Marriage	407.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	<p>Considers that the wholesale adoption of the MDRS standards and only the MDRS could well result in a drastic lowering of design standards of housing, given that there are no quality control standards applied at the same time.</p> <p>[See original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.	Accept in part.	No.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.116	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	<p>The Proposed Plan does not recognise rail as a qualifying matter. KiwiRail seeks that the railway corridor be identified as a qualifying matter and be applied to impose building setback requirements from the rail boundary.</p> <p>The Medium Density Residential Zone adjoins the rail corridor in several suburbs in Wellington City, including Wadestown, Ngaio, Khandallah, Johnsonville and Tawa. KiwiRail supports urban development, including around transport nodes, and recognises the benefits of co-locating housing near transport corridors.</p> <p>However, it is critical that the Proposed Plan provides for adequate management of the interface between urban development and lawfully established, critical infrastructure, such as the railway network. This is necessary to ensure our communities are built in healthy living environments, and the railway network can operate and develop in the future without constraint. An integrated and proactive approach to planning is critical to support the overall vision of our urban environments, and to ensure that our transport network can support the increasing growth and housing intensification.</p> <p>The nature of railway operations means KiwiRail cannot fully internalise all its effects within the railway corridor boundaries. Environmental legislation and caselaw recognises the lawful emission of such effects. Increasing development around railway corridors consequentially means the introduction of more sensitive receivers to adverse effects of existing and lawful railway activities. With a likely increase in sensitive activities forecast to locate in proximity to the railway corridor as a result of the Amendment Act, KiwiRail is concerned that without appropriate planning measures in place at a territorial level, the risk of adverse health and amenity effects impacting people locating in proximity to the railway corridor, and reverse sensitivity effects constraining our operations is significantly elevated.</p> <p>For this reason, it is essential that the Proposed Plan appropriately manages the development of new sensitive activities in proximity to the railway corridor.</p>	<p>Amend the MRZ Introduction as follows:</p> <p>There are parts of the Medium Density Residential Zone where the permitted development, height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters. These include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Character Precincts and the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct (refer to MRZ-PREC01 and MRZ-PREC02).</li> <li>- Wellington Fault (refer to Natural Hazards Chapter).</li> <li>- Stream corridors and overland flow paths (refer to Natural Hazards Chapter).</li> <li>- Medium and high coastal hazards (refer to Coastal Environment Chapter).</li> <li>- Very high and high coastal natural character areas (refer to Coastal Environment Chapter).</li> <li>- Coastal margins and riparian margins (refer to Coastal Environment and Natural Character Chapters).</li> <li>- Air noise overlay (refer to Noise Chapter).</li> <li>- Heritage buildings, heritage structures and heritage areas (refer to Historic Heritage Chapter).</li> <li>- Notable trees (refer to Notable Trees Chapter).</li> <li>- Sites and areas of significance to Māori (refer to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Chapter).</li> <li>- <u>Railway corridor (building setback from rail boundary); (refer to MRZ-S4).</u></li> </ul>	Reject.	No.



## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.27	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes changes to provisions and rules relating to the rail corridor as a qualifying matter in KiwiRail's submission.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Emma Osborne	410.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards.	Reject.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support in part	The introduction to this chapter is generally supported.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.	Reject.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers it would be helpful if it also recognises that retirement villages are provided for and that these have different built for requirements to meet the needs of residents.	Amend MRZ Introduction to read as follows (or words to similar effect):  The Medium Density Residential Zone adopts the medium density residential standards from the RMA which allow for three residential units of up to three storeys on a site. Multi-unit housing of four or more units is also anticipated through a resource consent process subject to standards and design guidance. <u>Retirement village development is also enabled and the provisions recognise the functional and operational needs of this type of housing.</u>	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.68	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Supports the medium density residential zone provisions (other than those referred to specifically in other submission points), noting these reflect the requirements of the medium density residential standards in the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.	Retain the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter as notified, subject to amendments sought in specific provisions comments on other submission points.	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.69	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Submitter notes the effect that the more permissive medium density residential standards will have on other zones. The zones supporting higher density development have more restrictive standards than in the MRZ, creating a risk that new development is concentrated in the more permissive MRZ at the exclusion of denser zones where Council wishes to encourage greater development. The PDP should ensure that the restrictions within denser zones are not substantially more restrictive than within the MRZ.  [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that Council consider the relationship between the Medium Density Residential Zone and denser zones (i.e. the High Density Residential Zone, Large Lot Residential Zone, Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre one, Commercial Zone, Mixed Use Zone, Metropolitan Centre Zone and City Centre Zone) to ensure development is not unduly restricted in denser zones by greater restrictions and Council discretion.	Reject.	No.
Luke Stewart	422.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.
Luke Stewart	422.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for recession planes.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative Medium Density Residential Standards recession planes.	Reject.	No.
Luke Stewart	422.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for building heights.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative Medium Density Residential Standards building height limits.	Reject.	No.
Luke Stewart	422.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what is proposed.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Stephen Minto	FS100.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter 234 wants to reduce shading as an issue when designing a development. But if people have solar panels on their house then this is an ongoing financial benefit that is lost. Compensation has not been considered or discussed in the submission. The criticality of sunlight to well being. It should be a right to have it in your house. It is known to help house sales so it has a value and the submitters place no value on it.</p> <p>Appreciates the submitter wants more houses and assumes they want affordable housing. Instead wants affordable housing and sees densification as having merits in the right places. Like in the brownfields of Te Aro. Not by ripping the heart out of our heritage/ character suburbs. Our heritage/chaacter suburbs are a finite asset that is special to NZ. Tourists talk about it being special and different. Our heritage is part of continuity with our past. And being connected to the past is a critical part of becoming aware of our identity as New Zealanders. Heritage gives us a sense of place. Our place. Try getting Parisians to pull down the Eiffel Tower now.</p> <p>Heritage buildings and character areas connect to the trees that covered our land and were destroyed. Respecting heritage houses gives us a chance to still see the beauty of their wood. The trees that are special to NZ. The Rimu reds, the various stains, the hardness of Matai. The connection to what makes NZ. So when we plant and replace it will mean a deeper understanding of the beauty that was destroyed. Protecting heritage therefore helps connect us to a better future and an awareness that we should not let that destruction happen again.</p> <p>Wellington has already lost most of its character and heritage from the central city. Lambton Quay destroyed but its no safer from earthquakes in fact less safe. Heritage and character just aren't looked after so they often are poor quality. Requiring them to be done up to an excellent standard would be cheaper and less carbon intensive than building new. Note: Cities can shape well being and happiness as well. They aren't just cost effective rooms to sleep in. [Inferred reference to submission point 234.7]</p>	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.31	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	Supports medium density residential standards as they allow 3 dwellings up to 3 storeys in height in all residential zones. This would enable higher levels of development than is currently proposed in the Draft District Plan in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential Zones	Not specified.	Accept.	No.
Michelle Rush	436.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the MRZ should be revised to reflect the walking catchments of the Johnsonville line as a rapid transit route. All other consequential amendments to the plan's sections should also be made to give effect to this.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone be revised to reflect the walking catchments of the Johnsonville Line as a Rapid Transit Line	Addressed in Report 1A.	
Michelle Rush	436.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Objectives and policies in the MRZ chapter are supported as they provide for intensification whilst safeguarding the environment.	Retain Objectives in the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Michelle Rush	436.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Objectives and policies in the MRZ chapter are supported as they provide for intensification whilst safeguarding the environment.	Retain Policies in the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that Newtown's residential streets outside the suburban centre should be classified as MRZ. In particular the zoning of several blocks around the Newtown suburban centre for heights of up to 21m seems unnecessary and counter productive to maintaining a well functioning urban environment.</p> <p>Allowing 6-storey development blocks in low-rise residential areas would have damaging effects on the value of neighbouring houses. Furthermore, combining terraced homes, typically of 3 storeys, with 6 storey apartment blocks doesn't give good results unless the sites are carefully planned.</p>	Seeks that the permitted heights for the medium density zones in Newtown and Berhampore to be 11m, not 14m.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Chrissie Potter	446.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (MRZ) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.	Addressed in Report 4B.	
Kay Larsen	447.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission]	Seeks that carefully thought out medium density houses considering sunlight and space a right to any people living in the neighbourhood is encouraged.	Reject.	No.
Dorothy Thompson	449.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Not specified	Supports that Character and Heritage are noted as qualifying matters under the RZ Pt1 Sch1 "height or density directed by the NPS-UD may be modified by qualifying matters".	Seeks that particular focus is taken to ensure that the district plan appropriately considers the transition from a residential area (Medium Density Residential Zone) to the City Centre Zone, especially on a street like Moir St where the District Plan seeks to protect the heritage and character values.	Addressed in Report 4B.	

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Guardians of the Bays	452.61	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers it would be useful to include cross references to qualifying matters in the rules to make the plan easier to understand their implications e.g. the Air Noise Overlay (Inner Air Noise Overlay and Outer Air Noise Overlay)	Amend rules to reference qualifying matters.	Reject.	No.
Daniel Christopher Murray Grantham	468.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that larger, more comprehensive developments are needed in our centres.	Seeks that height limits are increased in the 15 minute walking catchments to rail stations.	Reject.	No.
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations.	Reject.	No.
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Supports the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Seeks that the Medium Density Residential Zone is amended to include the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards recommendations for outdoor living space and green space.	Reject.	No.
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the scale of commercial activities that are permitted in MRZ should be increased where it's activities that involve people spending time together, such as daycares.	Seeks that the range of Permitted Activities in the Medium Density Residential Zone be expanded.	Reject.	No.
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that shading as a qualifying matter should be reduced from what's proposed.	Reject.	No.
Stephen Minto	FS100.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter 234 wants to reduce shading as an issue when designing a development. But if people have solar panels on their house then this is an ongoing financial benefit that is lost. Compensation has not been considered or discussed in the submission. The criticality of sunlight to well being. It should be a right to have it in your house. It is known to help house sales so it has a value and the submitters place no value on it.</p> <p>Appreciates the submitter wants more houses and assumes they want affordable housing. Instead wants affordable housing and sees densification as having merits in the right places. Like in the brownfields of Te Aro. Not by ripping the heart out of our heritage/ character suburbs. Our heritage/chaacter suburbs are a finite asset that is special to NZ. Tourists talk about it being special and different. Our heritage is part of continuity with our past. And being connected to the past is a critical part of becoming aware of our identity as New Zealanders. Heritage gives us a sense of place. Our place. Try getting Parisians to pull down the Eiffel Tower now.</p> <p>Heritage buildings and character areas connect to the trees that covered our land and were destroyed. Respecting heritage houses gives us a chance to still see the beauty of their wood. The trees that are special to NZ. The Rimu reds, the various stains, the hardness of Matai. The connection to what makes NZ. So when we plant and replace it will mean a deeper understanding of the beauty that was destroyed. Protecting heritage therefore helps connect us to a better future and an awareness that we should not let that destruction happen again.</p> <p>Wellington has already lost most of its character and heritage from the central city. Lambton Quay destroyed but its no safer from earthquakes in fact less safe. Heritage and character just aren't looked after so they often are poor quality. Requiring them to be done up to an excellent standard would be cheaper and less carbon intensive than building new. Note: Cities can shape well being and happiness as well. They aren't just cost effective rooms to sleep in. [Inferred reference to submission point 234.7]</p>	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Catharine Underwood	481.22	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that the MRZ for Brooklyn should be removed and the status quo remains until a proper character/heritage assessment has been completed for the Brooklyn Area. Allowing 11 and 14 metres in height is likely to undermine potential character areas could create towering buildings dominating the neighbourhood.	Opposes Brooklyn being classified as Medium Density Residential Zone until a character/heritage assessment has been completed for the Brooklyn Area.	Reject.	No.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.53	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support in part	Supports in principle the provision of medium density housing zones but it is vital that the design rules work well to ensure that these continue to provide quality private and public spaces.	Not specified.	Accept in part.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.98	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Support	Provision of medium density housing zones Provision of Character Precincts. Tall buildings create wind and shade problems	Allow	Accept in part.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Jonathan Markwick	490.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that where building height limits and recession planes and setbacks are mentioned in the PDP, these are made universally consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards.	Reject.	No.
Dinah Priestley	495.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	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 MRZ (Medium density residential zone) provisions are re-written to achieve reasonable intensification whilst maintaining and enhancing the existing valued housing stock. The provisions will need to recognize both residential character and heritage qualities ensure appropriate implementation.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.62	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	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.	No.
Dinah Priestley	495.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	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 MRZ (Medium density residential zone) provisions are re-written to achieve reasonable intensification whilst maintaining and enhancing the existing valued housing stock. The provisions will need to recognize both residential character and heritage qualities ensure appropriate implementation.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.63	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	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.	No.
Gareth Morgan	18.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Tall towers darken the landscape and the Oriental Bay Height Precinct will prevent this in Oriental Bay.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) provisions as notified [inferred decision requested]	Accept in part.	No.
Joanne Morgan	19.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	There has been significant investment by successive generations of Oriental Bay residents to preserve and restore the character of the area.  The regulation to establish a height limit over the Oriental Bay area has prevented the further construction of tall buildings. This has helped maintain the vista which is part of the experience of visiting Oriental Bay and its special character and heritage.	Seeks that the spirit of the regulated Oriental Bay Height Precinct is respected.  Retain General MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) as notified [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part.	No.
Ann Mallinson	81.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Considers that the height limits within the MRZ-PREC03 are appropriate, given these heights were set by decisions of the Environmental Court.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Oriental Bay Residents Association Inc	128.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports MRZ-PREC03 in its entirety.  The height controls are long standing and reflect detailed cost/benefit and legal investigation.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Oriental Bay Residents Association Inc	128.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports the proposed height restrictions of 11m in MRZ-PREC03 (or lower heights) because of qualifying matters that apply to Oriental Bay residential side streets including Hay Street and Baring Street.  There are many qualifying matters relating to the steep cliff side streets which render higher levels of development inappropriate. Those matters include safety to pedestrians on unformed paths, restricted access for emergency vehicles and a long history of slips and instability of the coastal cliffs.  Furthermore, the area has a special character and historic values, and comprises an iconic landscape of very high public significance.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Jennifer Mary Gyles	147.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports MRZ-PREC03 in its entirety.  The height controls are long standing and reflect detailed cost/benefit and legal investigation.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Jennifer Mary Gyles	147.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports the proposed height restrictions of 11m in MRZ-PREC03 (or lower heights) because of qualifying matters that apply to Oriental Bay residential side streets including Hay Street and Baring Street.  There are many qualifying matters relating to the steep cliff side streets which render higher levels of development inappropriate. Those matters include safety to pedestrians on unformed paths, restricted access for emergency vehicles and a long history of slips and instability of the coastal cliffs.  Furthermore, the area has a special character and historic values, and comprises an iconic landscape of very high public significance.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Escape Investments Limited	F5136.83	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	Oppose point 147.3 for a height control area of 11m for residential side streets off Oriental Parade. Residential side streets are not a Qualifying Matter. Qualifying Matters are set out & listed in s771 (a through j) of Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. Wellington has determined what Qualifying Matters apply to the City in the Proposed District Plan. Steep cliff side streets, pedestrians & vehicle access, & land stability are matters to be addressed in Assessment of Environmental Effects, as required by s88 RMA report. MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) is an appropriate precinct for recognising the aspects that have been tested before the courts. Any expansion to this precinct fails to give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Tore Hayward	170.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports the proposed maintenance of the existing Oriental Bay Height Area (MRZ-PREC03) along Oriental Parade.  Considers that increasing the height limits above this would detract significantly from the public amenity for those who visit Oriental Parade and use Oriental Bay beach.  [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Scott Galloway & Carolyn McLean	171.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports MRZ-PREC03 in its entirety.  The height controls are long standing and reflect detailed cost/benefit and legal investigation.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Pukepue Pari Residents Incorporated	237.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports MRZ-PREC03 - Oriental Bay Height Precinct and its long standing site by site height limits for Oriental Bay Parade sites.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Paul Ridley-Smith	245.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports MRZ-PREC03 - Oriental Bay Height Precinct and its long standing site by site height limits for Oriental Bay Parade sites and reflects detailed cost/benefit and legal investigation of local environmental effects.	Retain MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.320	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) is opposed and it is sought that the Council reviews the methods adopted to manage the identified townscape values in the proposed Oriental Bay Height Precinct. It is considered that an option would be to create and identify a viewshaft managing those significant public views to the monastery and the maunga (Mt Victoria).	Seeks that MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) is reviewed, so that the Council's adopted methods to manage the identified townscape values in the proposed Oriental Bay Height Precinct are reconsidered.	Reject.	No.
Ann Mallinson	F53.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	The review or elimination of MRZ-PREC-03 and policies and rules and standards relating to the Oriental Bay Height Precinct are opposed. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responded to the judgment in the submitter's successful legal case D Rendel, A Mallinson & others v Wellington City Council Decision No. W73/98 and provides protection for significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character in Oriental Bay. Refer to original submission 81 (points 81.3 and 81.4).	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Jackie Pope	FS8.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is extremely important to maintain important townscape and landscape values, and protects public views of Mt Victoria/Matairangi and St Gerards heritage site, and also supports the unique character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Denis Foot	FS10.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	The matters of the heights density and planning issues in Oriental Bay were the subject of a very expensive three week hearing at the Environment Court. The case was called Foot v WCC. In that case there were many lawyers, planners, urban designers, architects and residents that gave their views. Judge Kenderdine gave a very carefully considered judgement covering the various areas in Oriental Bay. The decision takes into account the diverse landforms which includes several valleys. There are still many areas in the Oriental Bay area where it is possible to build multi-storey apartments.  [Inferred reference to submission point 391.320]	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Oriental Bay Residents Association	FS13.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Ruapapa Limited	FS18.5	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay. The principles set out in the Environment Court decision in Foot v WCC should remain in place.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Scott Galloway and Carolyn McLean	FS19.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.10	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill.  Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	Opposes elements of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Jenny Gyles	FS53.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	Considers that the Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Helen Foot	FS62.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is extremely important to maintain important townscape and landscape values, and protects public views of Mt Victoria/Matairangi and St Gerards heritage site, and also supports the unique character of Oriental Bay. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct and in particular that part of it adjacent to Hay Street and Grass Street was the subject of a very careful review in the decision of the Environment Court in 1989 (Helen Foot and others v WCC Decision W79/98). There is nothing to be gained by seeking a review of this decision.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.101	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	Considers the Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant amenity value and character in Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Don MacKay	FS94.10	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.321	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	It is considered that MRZ-PREC02 (Oriental Bay Precinct) does not fulfil the matters of national importance as set out under section 6(f) and the requirements under section 77L and 77R of the RMA, and therefore do not meet the threshold to be applied as a qualifying matter to restrict height and density. Instead, it is sought that a Character Overlay is introduced into District-wide matters.	Delete MRZ-PREC-03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.4	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	The review or elimination of MRZ-PREC-03 and policies and rules and standards relating to the Oriental Bay Height Precinct are opposed. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responded to the judgment in the submitter's successful legal case D Rendel, A Mallinson & others v Wellington City Council Decision No. W73/98 and provides protection for significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character in Oriental Bay. Refer to original submission 81 (points 81.3 and 81.4).	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Jackie Pope	FS8.4	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is extremely important to maintain important townscape and landscape values, and protects public views of Mt Victoria/Matairangi and St Gerards heritage site, and also supports the unique character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Denis Foot	FS10.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	The matters of the heights density and planning issues in Oriental Bay were the subject of a very expensive three week hearing at the Environment Court. The case was called Foot v WCC. In that case there were many lawyers, planners, urban designers, architects and residents that gave their views. Judge Kenderdine gave a very carefully considered judgement covering the various areas in Oriental Bay. The decision takes into account the diverse landforms which includes several valleys. There are still many areas in the Oriental Bay area where it is possible to build multi-storey apartments.  [Inferred reference to submission point 391.321]	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Oriental Bay Residents Association	FS13.4	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ruapapa Limited	FS18.6	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay. The principles set out in the Environment Court decision in Foot v WCC should remain in place.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Scott Galloway and Carolyn McLean	FS19.4	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Jenny Gyles	FS53.4	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	Considers that the Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Helen Foot	FS62.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is extremely important to maintain important townscape and landscape values, and protects public views of Mt Victoria/Matairangi and St Gerards heritage site, and also supports the unique character of Oriental Bay. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct and in particular that part of it adjacent to Hay Street and Grass Street was the subject of a very careful review in the decision of the Environment Court in 1989 (Helen Foot and others v WCC Decision W79/98). There is nothing to be gained by seeking a review of this decision.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.102	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	Considers the Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant amenity value and character in Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
LIVE WELLington	FS96.21	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZPREC03	Oppose	A Character Overlay would not provide the necessary protection for the Oriental Bay precinct.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.20	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Oppose	A Character Overlay would not provide the necessary protection for the Oriental Bay precinct.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Richard Tweedie	392.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-PREC03	Support	Supports the current height controls proposed in the Oriental Bay Precinct.  Considers that the height controls are long standing and accepted.  The height controls should be set no greater than 11m. The area is very steep, prone to slips, has poor and congested access, and limited safety for pedestrians at present. Furthermore it is a unique character area with historic values and has a very special view from Oriental Bay.	Retain the building height controls in MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Precinct) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Tim Bright	75.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that a setback of more than 1m should be required to allow for more of a transition zone between Heritage Areas or Character Precincts.	Seeks that a setback of more than 1m is required from boundaries in or adjoining Character Precincts in the Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Scots College Incorporated	117.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Opposes the removal of the Educational Precincts and that educational activities on established school campuses will not be able to occur without resource consent.  Considers that the PDP fails to "roll over" more permissive ODP provisions for educational activities on the Scots College Campus. This will expose the College to risks and constraints.  It is the College's experience that the requirement for the College to have to apply for resource consent for new educational buildings that comply with the building standards of the ODP has not added any value or benefit to either the College or to residential neighbours.	Seeks that a permitted activity rule is added for Educational Activities where the activity is within an identified school campus as follows:  <u>MRZ-R11 Educational Activities</u>  <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u>  <u>Where: The activity is on a school campus identified on the Plan maps.</u>	Reject.	No.
Scots College Incorporated	117.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Considers that building work on identified school campuses that complies with the MRZ building height, bulk and location standards should be enabled (i.e. a permitted activity).  Building work on identified school campuses that does not meet the MRZ building height, bulk and location standards should require resource consent as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.  The rule requiring resource consent on identified school campus sites should include a clause precluding public notification.	Seeks that a rule is included for building work at identified Educational Precincts as follows:  <u>MRZ-18 Construction of, or additions and alterations to, buildings on identified school campuses.</u>  <u>MRZ18.1 Activity Status: Permitted</u> <u>Where: Compliance is achieved with MRZ-S2, MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4 and MRZ-S5.</u>  <u>MRZ18.2 Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary</u> <u>Where: Compliance is achieved with MRZ-S2, MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4 and MRZ-S5.</u>  <u>Notification Status: An application for resource consent made in respect of MRZ-18.2 is precluded from being publicly notified.</u>	Reject.	No.
Anne Lian	132.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.	Reject.	No.
Olivier Reuland	134.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.	Reject.	No.
Grant Buchan	143.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.	Reject.	No.
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.	Reject.	No.



## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Stephen Minto	FS100.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter 157 proposes the encouragement of "Pop-up public realm"s for dwellings shaded by developments. This is in effect telling people to go outside, to the beach or park if they want sun. Or a glass van will drive round and people can sit in it for 5 minutes before it drives away somewhere else. "Closing time drink up ya tea". That just doesn't match how people use their time, the independence of when you can relax. It's simply costly and silly.</p> <p>It is not even a viable proposal in the summer heat when you may want sun to warm the house or dry the clothes but not be in it. But especially in winter when sun is so important for comfort but it is still very cold outside. This heavily impacts the elderly and puts them at higher risk from illnesses. Wellington is not called windy for nothing.</p> <p>These suggestions take no account of how vulnerable some people feel outside and increases the chances of predatory behaviour onto the vulnerable.</p> <p>Every dwelling should be an excellent one and this submission does nothing for that. In theory even new developments could be overshadowed and it's just bad luck.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 157.9]</p>	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Patrick Wilkes	173.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.	Reject.	No.
Pete Gent	179.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.	Reject.	No.
James Harris	180.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that MRZ developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full details].</p>	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that Medium Density Residential Zone developments should adequately accommodate active travel as the building users' first-best choice for accessing it.	Reject.	No.
James Harris	180.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that MRZ developments should provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Seeks that a new standard is added requiring that Medium Density Residential Zone developments provide universal accessibility as a non-negotiable.	Reject.	No.
Historic Places Wellington	182.27	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that a policy similar to that requiring new development to positively contribute to the sense of place, quality and amenity of the Neighbourhood Centre Zone (NCZ-P7) by ensuring that development responds to the site context, particular where it is located adjacent to a scheduled site of significant to Māori, heritage buildings, structures or areas, character precincts, and other areas should be added.	Add a policy with equivalent wording to NCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) to the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.
Anne Lian	198.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.	Reject.	No.
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.	Reject.	No.
Alan Fairless	242.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that the District Plan include Sunlight provisions in ALL Residential Zones.	Seeks that the District Plan include Sunlight provisions in Medium Density Residential Zones.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.2	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.2	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Inconsistent with the Enabling Housing Act.	Disallow	Accept.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.167	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Seeks the addition of a new rule for 'emergency service facilities' for the reasons set out in the previous feedback point on the proposed definitions of 'emergency service facilities'. New fire stations may be necessary in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in stations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that FENZ is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations. FENZ considers that adding a new rule for Emergency Service Facilities provides for emergency service facilities in this zone as a permitted activity. This will better provide for health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations	Add new MRZ rule:  <u>MRZ-RX: Emergency Service Facilities</u> <u>Activity Status: Permitted</u>	Reject.	No.
Philippa O'Connor	289.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that commercial activities should be able to establish within the residential zones, and that the list of permitted activities is too small and should have a baseline of 100m2 for dairies, restaurants and cafes.	Add a new rule as follows:  <u>MRZ-R11 – Dairies, cafes and restaurants</u>  <u>1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u>  <u>Where:</u>  <u>a. The maximum GFA is 100m2</u>  <u>Matters of discretion are:</u>  <u>1. Infrastructure and servicing</u> <u>2. Effects on neighbourhood character, residential amenity, safety and the surrounding residential area from building scale, form and appearance; traffic; noise; lighting; and hours of operation</u>	Reject.	No.
Johanna Carter	296.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that a privacy rule should be included for developments that overlook each other or face each other as the PDP outlook provisions do not appear to achieve this and in some instances will have adjoining neighbours directly looking into each others' sites.	Seeks that a new standard for privacy is added.	Reject.	No.
Johanna Carter	296.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that the PDP is the only document that can protect light and sunlight reaching a property.  Considers there should be a rule that encourages passive solar design by maximising solar access to homes.	Seeks that a new standard for solar access to homes is added.  [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.103	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that the mandatory objectives of the Act are required to be included in the Proposed Plan as drafted in the MDRS. Objective 1 of the Act has not been integrated into the Proposed Plan.	Add new "Well-functioning urban environment" objective into the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter to ensure that mandatory Objective 1 of the Act is provided for in alignment with its intended direction and interpretation:  <u>MRZ-OX Well-functioning urban environment</u> <u>A well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.</u>	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.104	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that a policy regarding the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites and a policy recognising the changing nature of communities should be integrated into the District Plan.	Add the following Policies into the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter:  <u>RZ-PX Larger sites</u> <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within all residential zones by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u>  <u>RESZ-PX Changing communities</u> <u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the residential zones will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u>	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.105	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that it would be appropriate to enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments for the reasons set out in the submission above.	Add new "Role of density standards" policy into the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter:  <u>MRZ-PX Role of density standards</u> <u>Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</u>	Reject.	No.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that the proposed standards for permitted residential activities do not provide for rubbish/recycling storage. It is proposed that a standard be provided to allow for appropriate storage of a minimum standard.	Seeks that a new standard be added in the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter allowing for appropriate rubbish and recycling storage of a minimum standard.	Reject.	No.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Add a new policy providing for popup open spaces for houses that are shaded by new development.	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Stephen Minto	FS100.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submttr 378 proposes the encouragement of "Pop-up public realm"s for dwellings shaded by developments. This is in effect telling people to go outside, to the beach or park if they want sun. Or a glass van will drive round and people can sit in it for 5 minutes before it drives away somewhere else. 'Closing time drink up ya tea'. That just doesn't match how people use their time, the independence of when you can relax. It's simply costly and silly.</p> <p>It is not even a viable proposal in the summer heat when you may want sun to warm the house or dry the clothes but not be in it. But especially in winter when sun is so important for comfort but it is still very cold outside. This heavily impacts the elderly and puts them at higher risk from illnesses. Wellington is not called windy for nothing.</p> <p>These suggestions take no account of how vulnerable some people feel outside and increases the chances of predatory behaviour onto the vulnerable.</p> <p>Every dwelling should be an excellent one and this submission does nothing for that. In theory even new developments could be overshadowed and it's just bad luck.</p> <p>[Inferred reference to submission point 378.15]</p>	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.322	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that a new Objective should be added to the MRZ chapter to address provisionally provide for additional height and density in areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services. (Option B)	Add a new Objective to the Medium Density Residential Zone to provisionally provide for additional height and density in areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services.	Reject.	No.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	<p>Medium density zones should not become high density zones by default; this requirement would make nonsense of the zoning.</p> <p>Do not allow increased height and density in Medium Density Residential zones.</p>	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.109	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Considers the submission point is overly directive, and the current notified framework of objectives and policies strikes an appropriate balance.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.22	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	The proposal to add a new Objective to the Medium Density Residential Zone to provisionally provide for additional height and density in areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services is opposed. Due to Wellington's topography this would affect large areas and has not been adequately socialized.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.21	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	The proposal to add a new objective to the Medium Density Residential Zone to provisionally provide for additional height and density in areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services is opposed. Due to Wellington's topography this would affect large areas and has not been adequately socialized.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.323	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that a new Policy should be added to the MRZ chapter to address provisionally provide for additional height and density in areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services. (Option B)	Add a new Policy to the Medium Density Residential Zone to provisionally provide for additional height and density in areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services.	Reject.	No.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	<p>Medium density zones should not become high density zones by default; this requirement would make nonsense of the zoning.</p> <p>Do not allow increased height and density in Medium Density Residential zones.</p>	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.110	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Considers the submission point is overly directive, and the current notified framework of objectives and policies strikes an appropriate balance.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.23	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Add a new Policy to the Medium Density Residential Zone to provisionally provide for additional height and density in areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services is opposed. Due to Wellington's topography this would affect large areas and has not been adequately socialized.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.22	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Adding a new policy to the Medium Density Residential Zone to provisionally provide for additional height and density in areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services is opposed. Due to Wellington's topography this would affect large areas and has not been adequately socialized.	Disallow	Accept.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.324	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that there should be a new Rule to make heavy industry a Non-Complying activity which is consistent with other zone provisions and appropriate given the level of adverse effects which could be generated by heavy industrial activities. Consequential amendments to rule numbering will be required.	Add a new Rule to the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter as follows:  <u>Industrial Activities</u> <u>1. Activity status: Discretionary</u>  <u>Where:</u> <u>a. The activity is not a heavy industrial activity.</u>  <u>2. Activity Status: Non-complying</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>a. Compliance with the requirements of MRZ-RX.1 cannot be achieved</u>  <u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-RX.2.a must be publicly notified.</u>	Reject.	No.
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Add a new policy providing for popup open spaces for houses that are shaded by new development.	Reject.	No.
Stephen Minto	FS100.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Submtter 394 proposes the encouragement of "Pop-up public realm"s for dwellings shaded by developments. This is in effect telling people to go outside, to the beach or park if they want sun. Or a glass van will drive round and people can sit in it for 5 minutes before it drives away somewhere else. "Closing time drink up ya tea". That just doesn't match how people use their time, the independence of when you can relax. It's simply costly and silly.  It is not even a viable proposal in the summer heat when you may want sun to warm the house or dry the clothes but not be in it. But especially in winter when sun is so important for comfort but it is still very cold outside. This heavily impacts the elderly and puts them at higher risk from illnesses. Wellington is not called windy for nothing.  These suggestions take no account of how vulnerable some people feel outside and increases the chances of predatory behaviour onto the vulnerable.  Every dwelling should be an excellent one and this submission does nothing for that. In theory even new developments could be overshadowed and it's just bad luck.  [Inferred reference to submission point 394.14]	Disallow	Accept.	No.
David Cadman	398.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Add a new policy providing for popup open spaces for houses that are shaded by new development.	Reject.	No.
Stephen Minto	FS100.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Submtter 398 proposes the encouragement of "Pop-up public realm"s for dwellings shaded by developments. This is in effect telling people to go outside, to the beach or park if they want sun. Or a glass van will drive round and people can sit in it for 5 minutes before it drives away somewhere else. "Closing time drink up ya tea". That just doesn't match how people use their time, the independence of when you can relax. It's simply costly and silly.  It is not even a viable proposal in the summer heat when you may want sun to warm the house or dry the clothes but not be in it. But especially in winter when sun is so important for comfort but it is still very cold outside. This heavily impacts the elderly and puts them at higher risk from illnesses. Wellington is not called windy for nothing.  These suggestions take no account of how vulnerable some people feel outside and increases the chances of predatory behaviour onto the vulnerable.  Every dwelling should be an excellent one and this submission does nothing for that. In theory even new developments could be overshadowed and it's just bad luck.  [Inferred reference to submission point 398.13]	Disallow	Accept.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ministry of Education	400.93	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that the MRZ objectives do not sufficiently provide for additional infrastructure/ educational facilities. Therefore, the submitter supports the inclusion of a new objective as sought.	Add new objective to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) as follows:  <u>MRZ-OX</u>  <b>Non-Residential activities</b>  <u>Non-residential activities are in keeping with the amenity of the Medium Density Residential zone and provide for the community's social, economic, and cultural wellbeing.</u>	Reject.	No.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.8	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Support	Considers that a blanket statement on non-residential activities opens up to any non-residential activity which the submitter would like disallowed. The submitter however supports non-residential educational activities.	Amend / Seeks that only non-residential educational activities are allowed but not any non-residential activities.	Accept.	No.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.47	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that for the areas that are subject to qualifying matters as referenced in the MRZ introduction and in MRZ-P4, there appears to be no recognition or provisions that address the effect of surrounding or adjacent medium or high density development on those identified areas.  Submitter considers that provisions that recognise the need for and provide for specific controls in buffer areas adjacent to identified areas such as heritage areas and character areas are needed to control inappropriate development alongside these areas that would compromise the values or matters for which they are recognised.	Seeks that new rules and standards on development in the areas adjacent to those areas which have been identified under qualifying matters be inserted into the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone).	Reject.	No.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.74	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that the chapter should include a policy similar to NZC-P7 ensuring that development responds to site context, where it is located adjacent to a site of significance to Māori, heritage place or character precinct.	Add a policy similar to NCZ-P7 (Quality design – neighbourhood and townscape outcomes) ensuring that development responds to site context, where it is located adjacent to a site of significance to Māori, heritage place or character precinct.	Reject.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 requires that the Proposed Plan include the following objective: "a well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future".	Provide a separate objective relating to the efficient use of land as follows (or words to similar effect):  <u>Land within the Medium Density Residential Zone is used efficiently for residential development, and more intensive development is enabled on larger sites.</u>	Reject.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers an additional policy is necessary relating to the efficient use of land as this aligns with the strategic direction and the proposed objective above.	Insert an additional policy relating to the efficient use of larger sites as follows (or words to similar effect):  <u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u>	Reject.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that in order to be consistent with the strategic direction of the Proposed Plan, it is also necessary and appropriate to recognise the demand for housing and care needs of the ageing population. Due to the ageing population, longer life expectancy, and desire to live in a retirement village, there is a housing crisis for the elderly. It is critical that this demand is recognised and provided for in the Proposed District Plan.	Insert an additional policy relating to the efficient use of larger sites as follows (or words to similar effect):  <u>Recognise and provide for the demand for housing and care needs of the ageing population</u>	Reject.	No.
Luke Stewart	422.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.	Reject.	No.
Stephen Minto	FS100.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	Submitter 422 proposes the encouragement of "Pop-up public realm"s for dwellings shaded by developments. This is in effect telling people to go outside, to the beach or park if they want sun. Or a glass van will drive round and people can sit in it for 5 minutes before it drives away somewhere else. 'Closing time drink up ya tea'. That just doesn't match how people use their time, the independence of when you can relax. It's simply costly and silly.  It is not even a viable proposal in the summer heat when you may want sun to warm the house or dry the clothes but not be in it. But especially in winter when sun is so important for comfort but it is still very cold outside. This heavily impacts the elderly and puts them at higher risk from illnesses. Wellington is not called windy for nothing.  These suggestions take no account of how vulnerable some people feel outside and increases the chances of predatory behaviour onto the vulnerable.  Every dwelling should be an excellent one and this submission does nothing for that. In theory even new developments could be overshadowed and it's just bad luck.  [Inferred reference to submission point 422.10]	Disallow	Accept.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Amend	Considers that where shading is qualifying matter, there is a new policy for providing pop-up public realm for development-shaded homes.	Seeks that there is a new policy providing for pop-up public realm for houses that are shaded by new development.	Reject.	No.
Stephen Minto	FS100.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / New MRZ	Oppose	<p>Submitter 472 proposes the encouragement of "Pop-up public realm"s for dwellings shaded by developments. This is in effect telling people to go outside, to the beach or park if they want sun. Or a glass van will drive round and people can sit in it for 5 minutes before it drives away somewhere else. 'Closing time drink up ya tea'. That just doesn't match how people use their time, the independence of when you can relax. It's simply costly and silly.</p> <p>It is not even a viable proposal in the summer heat when you may want sun to warm the house or dry the clothes but not be in it. But especially in winter when sun is so important for comfort but it is still very cold outside. This heavily impacts the elderly and puts them at higher risk from illnesses. Wellington is not called windy for nothing.</p> <p>These suggestions take no account of how vulnerable some people feel outside and increases the chances of predatory behaviour onto the vulnerable.</p> <p>Every dwelling should be an excellent one and this submission does nothing for that. In theory even new developments could be overshadowed and it's just bad luck.</p>	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Oranga Tamariki	83.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-01	Support	<p>Oranga Tamariki support this objective.</p> <p>Oranga Tamariki homes are encompassed by the residential activities definition.</p> <p>If the nesting recommendation for supported residential care is accepted, this objective will be further strengthened.</p>	Retain MRZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Leeanne Templer	206.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-01	Amend	<p>Considers that MRZ-01 does not respond to Rama Crescents planned urban built character, as the MRZ is not in line with the mainly 2 storey, protected views and diplomatic residential neighbourhood.</p> <p>Rama Crescent does not have the infrastructure for further intensification.</p> <p>There is a need to retain existing covenants on titles in Rama Crescent which protect views.</p> <p>There needs to be provision for onsite parking in Rama Crescent because public transport can't enter and walking is tough.</p> <p>Ambassadorial residencies on the street require privacy and further stories and intensification would compromise this.</p>	Seeks that Rama Crescent and streets above Rama Crescent are exempt from the building height increases and intensification in the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone).	Reject.	No.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.48	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-01	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.	Reject.	No.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.180	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-01	Support	Supports MRZ-01 (noting it reflects that required under Schedule 3A Part 1(6)(1) of the RMA) in that it recognises a range of residential activities and housing types.	Retain Objective MRZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.	Reject	No.
Khoi Phan	326.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-01	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend Objective MRZ-01 to allow up to 6-storey buildings.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.106	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-01	Support in part	Considers that the current drafting of MRZ-01 generally aligns with the wording of Objective 2 of the MDRS, however the objectives of the MDRS need to be incorporated as drafted under the Enabling Housing Act. Considers that a consequential amendment will be needed to specify the purpose of the MRZ is to provide for predominately residential activities.	Retain MRZ-01 (Purpose) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.107	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-01	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of MRZ-01 generally aligns with the wording of Objective 2 of the MDRS, however the objectives of the MDRS need to be incorporated as drafted under the Enabling Housing Act. Considers that a consequential amendment will be needed to specify the purpose of the MRZ is to provide for predominately residential activities.	<p>Amend MRZ-01 (Purpose) as follows:</p> <p><b>Purpose Residential density</b></p> <p>The Medium Density Residential Zone provides for <del>predominantly residential activities</del> and a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to:</p> <p>...</p>	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.109	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-01	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.319	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-01	Support	Increasing density in Wellington in areas well serviced by transportation and facilities is an important part of reducing the city's carbon footprint; reducing congestion and improving economic and social wellbeing.	Retain MRZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.	Reject	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.325	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-01	Support in part	Objective MRZ-01 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective MRZ-01 (Purpose) with amendment.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.326	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-01	Amend	Considers that Objective MRZ-01 should be amended to provide for additional height and density in areas in the MRZ with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services. (Option A)	Amend Objective MRZ-01 (Purpose) as follows: The Medium Density Residential Zone provides for predominantly residential activities and a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to:  1. Housing needs and demand; and 2. The neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including 3 storey buildings and additional height and density in areas of high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services.	Accept in part	Yes
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.32	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ01	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose enabling further intensified development unless there are the necessary controls to manage potential effects of water bodies and freshwater ecosystems to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to Proposed RPS Change 1. Greater Wellington also consider that any further intensification will not be feasible unless there is investment in associated infrastructure.	Disallow / Seeks that additional provisions are included to give effect to the NPS-FM and have regard to proposed RPS change 1 to manage the effects of urban development on freshwater.	Accept in part	Yes.
LIVE Wellington	FS96.24	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-01	Oppose	The submission to introduce additional height limits to the MRZ is opposed. While these may be appropriate in some circumstances, it is more appropriate to require notification for additional height in these residential areas.	Disallow	Accept in part	No.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.23	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-01	Oppose	The submission to introduce additional height limits to the MRZ is opposed. While these may be appropriate in some circumstances, it is more appropriate to require notification for additional height in these residential areas.	Disallow	Accept in part	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-02	Amend	Considers that the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 requires that the Proposed Plan include certain objectives, including the following objective: a relevant residential zone provides for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to— (i) housing needs and demand; and (ii) the neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including 3-storey buildings.  MRZ-01 does not accurately reflect the wording required in the Amendment Act.	Amend MRZ-02 (Efficient use of land) to reflect Objective 2 as in the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.	Reject.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-02	Oppose in part	Considers the objective does not align with the required objectives in the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.	Accept in part.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-02	Amend	Considers the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 requires that the Proposed Plan include the following objective: "a well-functioning urban environment that enables all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future".	Amend MRZ-02 (Efficient use of land) to reflect Objective 2 as in the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Leeanne Templer	206.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-02	Amend	<p>Considers that MRZ does not contribute positively to a changing and well-functioning urban environment in Rama Crescent, as per MRZ-02.</p> <p>Rama Crescent does not have the infrastructure for further intensification.</p> <p>There is a need to retain existing covenants on titles in Rama Crescent which protect views.</p> <p>There needs to be provision for onsite parking in Rama Crescent because public transport can't enter and walking is tough.</p> <p>Ambassadorial residencies on the street require privacy and further stories and intensification would compromise this.</p>	Seeks that Rama Crescent and streets above Rama Crescent are exempt from the building height increases and intensification in the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone).	Reject.	No.
Toka Tū Ake EQC	282.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-02	Amend	<p>Considers that Wellington City is at risk from multiple natural hazards, and it is important that intensification developments do not increase the public's exposure to natural hazard risks. Considers that any development should adequately account for natural hazard risk at the site, to not significantly increase exposure through poor land use decisions.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-02 (Efficient use of land) as follows:</p> <p>Land within the Medium Density Residential Zone is used efficiently for residential development that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases housing supply and choice; and</li> <li>Contributes positively to a changing and well-functioning urban environment; <u>and</u></li> <li><u>Does not increase exposure to natural hazard risk, and is not located within a high ranked hazard area.</u></li> </ol>	Reject.	No.
Pukepūke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.26	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ-02	Support	<p>Considers that the submitter raises an important issue. This is relevant to and supports the further submitter's submission points around the vulnerability of some sites in Hay Street and the 'Hay Street Extension' to earthquakes and slippage. The further submitter notes in this context and support the comments of the ICNZ on 23 November 2022 that councils should do more to stop development in high hazard zones.</p>	Allow	Reject.	No.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.49	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-02	Support	<p>Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.</p>	Retain MRZ-02 (Efficient use of land) as notified.	Reject	No.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.181	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-02	Support in part	<p>Considers that within the Medium Density Residential Zone existing qualifying matter areas may limit the amount of permitted medium density development possible on an allotment. Considers while the policy directive is supported, the submitter supports reference to qualifying matter areas as they directly influence the capacity for intensification and residential development.</p>	Retain Objective MRZ-02 (Efficient use of land), subject to amendment.	Reject.	No.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.182	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-02	Amend	<p>Considers that within the Medium Density Residential Zone existing qualifying matter areas may limit the amount of permitted medium density development possible on an allotment. Considers while the policy directive is supported, the submitter supports reference to qualifying matter areas as they directly influence the capacity for intensification and residential development.</p>	<p>Amend Objective MRZ-02 (Efficient use of land) as follows:</p> <p>MRZ-02 Efficient use of land</p> <p>Land within the Medium Density Residential Zone is used efficiently for residential development that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases housing supply and choice; and</li> <li>Contributes positively to a changing and well-functioning urban environment; <u>while avoiding inappropriate locations, heights and densities of buildings and development within qualifying matter areas as specified by the relevant qualifying matter area provisions.</u></li> </ol>	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.25	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-02	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora opposes the amendment which seeks to introduce 'avoid' into an objective that seeks to enable urban development.</p>	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.108	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-02	Support in part	<p>Considers that the current drafting of MRZ-02 is inconsistent with Objectives 1 and 2 of the MDRS. Objectives 1 and 2 of the Act should be included in the Proposed Plan verbatim to their drafting in the MDRS. Questions what the context is in relation to contributing 'positively' to a changing and well-functioning urban environment. Considers that it is unclear what this would entail, particularly when considering that the definition of 'well functioning urban environment' consists of a list of positive / beneficial matters. Considers that it is not clear if this phrasing is stipulating that additional benefit is required in order to contribute 'positively'.</p>	<p>Retain MRZ-02 (Efficient use of land) and seeks amendment as follows:</p> <p>Land within the Medium Density Residential Zone is used efficiently for residential development that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increases housing supply and choice; and</li> <li>Contributes <u>positively</u> to a changing and well-functioning urban environment.</li> </ol>	Accept.	Yes.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.110	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-02	Support	<p>[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]</p>	Retain MRZ-02 (Efficient use of land) as notified.	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.320	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-02	Support	<p>Increasing density in Wellington in areas well serviced by transportation and facilities is an important part of reducing the city's carbon footprint; reducing congestion and improving economic and social wellbeing.</p>	Retain MRZ-02 (Efficient use of land) as notified.	Reject.	No.



## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.327	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O2	Support	Objective MRZ-O2 is generally supported.	Retain Objective MRZ-O2 (Efficient use of land) as notified.	Reject.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.168	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O3	Support	Supports the objective as it promotes safe and accessible living environments.	Retain MRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible, and attractive environments) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.50	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O3	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.183	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O3	Support	Supports MRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) in that it recognises safe living environments. Considers the management of activities within proximity of the National Grid gives effect to the objective in providing safe environments.	Retain Objective MRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.109	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O3	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of MRZ-O3 is inconsistent with Objective 1 and Policy 3 of the MDRS. In addition, notes that MRZ-O3 makes reference to 'accessible living environments'. Opposes regulation of internal environments as retirement village operators are best placed to understand the accessibility requirements of their residents and access is addressed by the Building Act.	Seeks to amend MRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) to delete reference to "accessible living environments".	Reject.	No.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.111	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) as notified.	Accept.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.321	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O3	Support	Increased density needs to be done well: this objective gives an important signal to ensure that this is achieved.	Retain MRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.328	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-O3	Support	Objective MRZ-O3 is generally supported.	Retain Objective MRZ-O3 (Healthy, safe, accessible and attractive environments) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.270	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-O1	Not specified	Submitter takes a neutral position on MRZ-PREC03-P1. Notes that relief sought to MRZ-PREC03 applies to this policy.	Not specified.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.331	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-O1	Oppose	MRZ-PREC03-O1 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete Objective MRZ-PREC03-O1 (Purpose) as notified.	Reject.	No.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.27	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZPREC03-O1	Oppose	Character precincts are a justifiable means of protecting unique Wellington areas of Victorian and Edwardian native timber housing, that is of a cohesive style and form. Many of these areas are iconic to Wellington.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.26	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ PREC03-O1	Oppose	Character precincts are a justifiable means of protecting unique Wellington areas of Victorian and Edwardian native timber housing, that is of a cohesive style and form. Many of these areas are iconic to Wellington.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.53	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-O1	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-O1 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form.  The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-O1 (Purpose) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Oranga Tamariki	83.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Support	Oranga Tamariki support this policy, in particular the specific inclusion of supported residential care activities in (4).  Supported residential care homes are considered to encompass Oranga Tamariki homes.	Retain MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.	Reject	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Scots College Incorporated	117.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Support in part	<p>Considers that educational activities on the Scots College, Samuel Marsden College, Queen Margaret College and St Marks Church School campuses should be provided with permitted activity status to reflect their essential role in meeting the educational needs of residents of the City and so that they are treated by the District Plan similarly to public schools.</p> <p>The "Educational Precincts" in the Operative District Plan should be retained in the PDP.</p> <p>The PDP fails to "roll over" more permissive ODP provisions for educational activities on the Scots College Campus. This will expose the College to risks and constraints.</p> <p>It is the College's experience that the requirement for the College to have to apply for resource consent for new educational buildings that comply with the building standards of the ODP has not added any value or benefit to either the College or to residential neighbours.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>7. Educational activities on school campuses identified in the District Plan Maps.</p>	Reject.	No.
Avryl Bramley	202.37	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Amend	<p>Considers that these provisions allow the creeping commercialisation of these suburbs. There is no limit as to the number of these businesses that may be established in a suburb and a single business could begin to operate over a number of adjacent sites.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p><del>3-Visitor Accommodation</del></p> <p><del>4-Supported Residential</del></p> <p><del>5-Childcare Services</del></p> <p>...</p>	Accept in part.	Yes.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Support	<p>Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.</p>	<p>Retain MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.</p>	Reject.	No.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the enabled activities policies and permitted land use activity rules applying to supported residential care activities in the Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Large Lot Residential and Corrections zones are retained as notified.</p> <p>The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities. Such activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.</p>	<p>Retain MRZ-P1.4 (Enabled activities) as notified if "supported residential care activity" definition and references to term are retained.</p>	Accept.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.169	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Support in part	<p>Considers emergency service activities, including the establishment of fire stations, are an integral part of providing for the health, safety, and wellbeing of people in the community. As such, FENZ seeks an amendment to MRZ-P1 to enable the establishment of emergency service facilities in the Medium Density Residential zone.</p>	<p>Supports MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities), with amendment.</p>	Reject.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.170	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Amend	<p>Considers emergency service activities, including the establishment of fire stations, are an integral part of providing for the health, safety, and wellbeing of people in the community. As such, FENZ seeks an amendment to MRZ-P1 to enable the establishment of emergency service facilities in the Medium Density Residential zone.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows:</p> <p>Enable residential activities and other activities that are compatible with the purpose of the Medium Density Residential Zone, while ensuring their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Home Business;</li> <li>2. Boarding Houses;</li> <li>3. Visitor Accommodation;</li> <li>4. Supported Residential Care;</li> <li>5. Childcare Services; and</li> <li>6. Community Gardens.</li> <li>7. Emergency service facilities</li> </ol>	Reject.	No.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Support in part	<p>Considers the scope of activities enabled in the Medium Density Residential zone are limited and do not align with current rule MRZ-R10 or proposed new rule MRZ-P11.</p>	<p>Retain Policy MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) with amendment.</p>	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Phillippa O'Connor	289.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Amend	Considers the scope of activities enabled in the Medium Density Residential zone are limited and do not align with current rule MRZ-R10 or proposed new rule MRZ-P11.	Amend Policy MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows:  Enable residential activities and other activities that are compatible with the purpose of the Medium Density Residential Zone, while ensuring their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone, including:  <del>1. Home Business;</del> <del>2. Boarding Houses;</del> <del>3. Visitor Accommodation;</del> <del>4. Supported Residential Care;</del> <del>5. Childcare Services; and</del> <del>6. Community Gardens.</del>	Accept in part.	Yes.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.51	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Khoi Phan	326.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows:  Enable residential activities and other activities that are compatible with the purpose of the Medium Density Residential Zone, while ensuring their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone, including:  1. Home Business; 2. Boarding Houses; 3. Visitor Accommodation; 4. Supported Residential Care; 5. Childcare Services; <del>and</del> 6. Community Gardens; <del>and</del> 7. Commercial Activities	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.110	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Oppose	Considers that the policy appears to identify / support the permitted activities of the MDR Zone - being some residential activities (e.g. boarding houses, visitor accommodation and supported residential care), and some non-residential activities (e.g. home businesses, childcare services and community gardens). Considers that retirement villages are residential activities that should be permitted in the residential zones. Rather than listing retirement villages in this policy, considers that an enabling retirement village-specific policy (MRZ-P6) is more appropriate. Considers that while the policy is seeking to 'enable' the permitted activities in the zone, the phrasing of the policy qualifies this enabling provision by reference to a scale and intensity that is 'consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the zone'. Considers this part of MRZ-P1 conflicts with the MDRS in that it seeks to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act for the MRZ. Considers that MRZ-P1 appears to summarise provisions provided elsewhere in the chapter, but in a confusing manner that does not provide any additional guidance for consent applicants or other users of the District Plan.	Delete MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) in its entirety as notified.	Reject.	No.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.112	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.332	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Support in part	MRZ-P1 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) with amendment.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.333	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Amend	Considers that NOISE-P3 should be clarified to better recognise the intent of the NPS-UD (particularly Policy 6) that recognises the planned urban built form and that change to existing amenity is not in itself an adverse effect.	Amend MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows:  Enable residential activities and other activities that are compatible with the purpose of the Medium Density Residential Zone, while ensuring their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values anticipated and planned built form of for the Zone, including:  1. Home Business; 2. Boarding Houses; 3. Visitor Accommodation; 4. Supported Residential Care; 5. Childcare Services; and 6. Community Gardens.	Reject.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Oppose	The policy is being introduced as part of the P1 Sch1 process but is inconsistent with the mandatory policies in the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 which seek to enable a variety of housing typologies regardless of their use.  It should therefore be limited to "other activities".	Seeks to remove this policy.	Reject.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P1	Oppose	The policy is being introduced as part of the P1 Sch1 process but is inconsistent with the mandatory policies in the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 which seek to enable a variety of housing typologies regardless of their use.  It should therefore be limited to "other activities".	Seeks to amend MRZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows:  Enable residential activities and other activities that are compatible with the purpose of the Medium Density Residential Zone, while ensuring their scale and intensity is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone, including:  1. Home Business; 2. <del>Boarding Houses;</del> 3. <del>Visitor Accommodation;</del> 4. <del>Supported Residential Care;</del> 5. Childcare Services; and 6. Community Gardens.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.52	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P2	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.27	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P2	Support	Supports the inclusion of a policy enabling a variety of housing typologies within the zone.	Retain MRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P2	Support	Supports policy MRZ-P2. Notes that Disabled people currently lack housing choices due to the traditional design of housing not enabling accessibility. Concepts, such as Universal Design, need to be incorporated into the design of all new builds and this can be done with a wide range of housing designs. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]	Retain MRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as notified.  [Inferred decision requested]	Accept.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.111	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P2	Support	Supports MRZ-P2 as it aligns with Policy 1 of the MDRS.	Retain MRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as notified.	Accept.	No.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.113	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P2	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.334	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P2	Support in part	MRZ-P2 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.335	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P2	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P2 should be amended to provide for additional height and density in areas in the MRZ with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services. (Option A)	Amend MRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as follows:  Enable a variety of housing typologies with a mix of densities within the zone, including 3-storey attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments up to 5 storeys in areas of in areas of high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services..	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Metlifecare Limited	413.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P2	Support	Supports this policy on the basis it is required by the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.	Retain MRZ-P2 (Housing supply and choice) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.53	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P3	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.28	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P3	Support	Supports the inclusion of this policy as it supports the development of papakāinga housing.	Retain MRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P3	Amend	Considers that replacing the term 'abilities' with 'impairments' in MRZ-P3 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 MRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as follows: Enable housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents, and encourage a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures to cater for people of all ages, lifestyles and <del>abilities</del> <b>impairments</b> . [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part.	Yes.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.112	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P3	Oppose in part	Considers that the current drafting of the first part of MRZ-P3 aligns with the wording of Policy 4 of the MDRS; however surplus to the requirements of the Act MRZ-P3 seeks to 'encourage a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures to cater for people of all ages, lifestyles and abilities', which is generally already covered by MRZ-P2.	Opposes MRZ-P3 (Housing needs) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.113	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P3	Amend	Considers that the current drafting of the first part of MRZ-P3 aligns with the wording of Policy 4 of the MDRS; however surplus to the requirements of the Act MRZ-P3 seeks to 'encourage a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures to cater for people of all ages, lifestyles and abilities', which is generally already covered by MRZ-P2.	Amend MRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as follows: Enable housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents, <del>and encourage a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures to cater for people of all ages, lifestyles and abilities.</del>	Reject.	No.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.114	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.336	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P3	Support in part	MRZ-P3 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-P3 (Medium density residential standards) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.337	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P3	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P3 should be amended to remove reference of tenures. This would recognise that tenures cannot and should not be managed through the District Plan.	Amend MRZ-P3 (Medium density residential standards) as follows: Enable housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents, and encourage a variety of housing types, <u>and</u> sizes <del>and</del> tenures to cater for people of all ages, lifestyles and abilities.	Reject.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P3	Support in part	Supports this policy on the basis it is required by the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.	Accept.	Yes.
Metlifecare Limited	413.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P3	Amend	Considers an addition has been made to indicate that housing should cater for people of all ages, lifestyles and abilities. The amendments made create a new consideration that was not anticipated by the mandatory policy. It also unnecessarily overlaps with the policy enabling a variety of housing typologies (P2). Therefore, while Metlifecare supports the intention of the addition that was made, it	Amend MRZ-P3 (Housing needs) as follows (or words to similar effect): Enable housing to be designed to meet the day-to-day needs of residents, <del>including by and encourage</del> a variety of housing types, sizes and tenures to and catering for people of all ages, lifestyles and abilities.	Accept.	Yes.
Leeanne Templer	206.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P4	Amend	Considers that Rama Crescent does not have the infrastructure for further intensification.  Considers that there is a need to retain existing covenants on titles in Rama Crescent which protect views.  Considers that there needs to be provision for onsite parking in Rama Crescent because public transport can't enter and walking is tough.  Considers that ambassadorial residencies on the street require privacy and further stories and intensification would compromise this.	Seeks an amendment to MRZ-P4 (Medium Density Residential Standards) to exclude Rama Crescent and streets above it from the application of MRZ-P4.	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.54	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P4	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.29	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P4	Support	Supports the recognition of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu and other taonga.	Retain MRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.184	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P4	Support	Supports MRZ-P4 (noting it reflects that required under Schedule 3A Part 1(6)(2) of the RMA) in that it recognises qualifying matters.	Retain MRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.114	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P4	Oppose in part	Supports MRZ-P4 to the extent it aligns with Policy 2 of the MDRS. However, considers that the replacement of "all relevant residential zones" with reference to the MRZ creates interpretation issues as it suggests the medium density residential standards do not apply in parts of the MRZ (but not what standards apply instead). Areas subject to qualifying matters have not been zoned MRZ so that part of the policy is not required.	Opposes MRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) and seeks amendment as follows:  Apply the medium density residential standards across the Medium Density Residential Zone <del>except in circumstances where a qualifying matter is relevant (including matters of significance such as historic heritage and the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga).</del>	Reject.	No.
Wellington Tenth Trust	363.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P4	Amend	Considers that conversation around amending height control limit is appropriate. [see original submission]	Seeks to amend MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control 2) height control limit at 557 Adelaide Road from 14m to heights advised by the Wellington Tenth Trust.	Reject.	No.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.115	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.338	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P4	Support	MRZ-P4 is generally supported.	Retain MRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P4	Support	Supports this policy on the basis it is required by the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.	Retain MRZ-P4 (Medium density residential standards) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.55	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P5	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.30	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P5	Support	Supports the inclusion of a policy which provides for developments not meeting permitted activity status given marae activities may require resource consent.	Retain MRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.115	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P5	Support	Supports MRZ-P5 as it aligns with Policy 5 of the MDRS.	Retain MRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) as notified.	Accept.	No.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.116	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.339	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P5	Support	MRZ-P5 is generally supported.	Retain MRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.22	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P5	Support	Supports this policy on the basis it is required by the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.	Retain MRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) as notified.	Accept.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.36	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P5	Amend	Considers that Council's scope is too broad under this policy as it would allow Council to change any aspect of a proposal.	Amend MRZ-P5 (Developments not meeting permitted activity status) to:  Provide for developments not meeting permitted activity status, while encouraging high-quality developments buildings.	Reject.	No.
Stratum Management Limited	249.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that policy MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) seeks to provide for multi-unit housing where the development can demonstrate four factors. The first matter relates to 'fulfilling' the intent of the residential design guide. The residential design guide, as notified, contains 137 individual guidelines. It is unclear how, or at what point, any given multi-unit development can fulfil the intent of the design guide given that a design guide assessment is inherently a subjective assessment. Is the intent of the design guide fulfilled when a proposal is considered to achieve more than 50% of the applicable design guides for example? The approach to this matter is also inconsistent with the approach adopted by the City Centre zone. In that zone, the reference to the design guide is made within the matters for discretion of, for example, Rule CCZ-R20. It also omits reference to 'fulfilling the intent of' the design guide. This approach is preferred. The second matter requires the provision of a minimum area of private or shared open space. In the context of this policy, a multi-unit development that does not meet the minimum area standard should not be provided for.  Notwithstanding that non-compliance with the standard can be considered through a resource consent process. Matter 3 requires the provision for on site management of waste storage and collection. This matter is also considered through the design guide. Stratum invites further consideration of the appropriate means to achieve this and suggests that there may be duplication across the policy and design guide.	Amend MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows:  Delete matters (1);  Delete the words 'a minimum area of' from matter (2);  Consider whether the policy needs to address matters relating to waste storage and collection.	Reject.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.171	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for multi-unit housing and retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development can be adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure, or can address any constraints on the site.	Retain MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support in part	Considers that Reference to the Design Guide as a matter of discretion (by virtue of referring to Policy MRZ-P6 in the matters of discretion for activities requiring consent under MRZ-R14) is challenged and deletion sought accordingly. Given the prescriptive, yet subjective, nature of the assessment, elevating this Guide to a statutory requirement for compliance or assessment is not considered appropriate or commensurate in respect of a restricted discretionary activity assessment.	Retain MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that Reference to the Design Guide as a matter of discretion (by virtue of referring to Policy MRZ-P6 in the matters of discretion for activities requiring consent under MRZ-R14) is challenged and deletion sought accordingly. Given the prescriptive, yet subjective, nature of the assessment, elevating this Guide to a statutory requirement for compliance or assessment is not considered appropriate or commensurate in respect of a restricted discretionary activity assessment.	Amend MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows:  Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development:  <del>1. Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide;</del> <u>1.</u> <del>2.</del> Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants; <u>2.</u> <del>3.</del> Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and <u>3.</u> <del>4.</del> Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.	Reject.	No.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.56	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.31	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support	Supports the inclusion of a policy providing for multi-unit housing in the Medium Density Residential Zone, and the reference to the Residential Design Guide (as this supports papakāinga).	Retain MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.38	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) with amendment.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Paihikara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.39	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P6 should be amended, as multi-unit housing and other non-residential activities and building cannot require car parking as set out in the NPS-UD. Developments should provide adequate and appropriately located cycle and micromobility parking to align with infrastructure and transport objectives in the PDP.	Amend MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows:  Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development:  1. Fulfils the intent of the Residential Design Guide; 2. Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants; 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site. 5. <u>Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for cycle and micromobility parking and charging.</u> 6. <u>Adequate cycle facilities are accessible, secure, and covered (protected from weather)</u>	Reject.	No.
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support	Supports policy MRZ-P6. Notes that disabled people need to be accommodated in all types of housing, including in multiunit housing which will only grow in number as housing intensification increases. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]	Retain MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as notified.  [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that as it stands, the PDP will enable the construction and use of three dwellings on properties that share a common boundary with the Z on Constable Street, with a maximum height of 11m and more permissive building recession planes, as a permitted activity. In addition, resource consents may be obtained as a restricted discretionary activity to construct buildings on these properties up to 25m in height with no limit to the number of residential units (i.e.: density). These greater residential densities and more permissive building standards are likely to generate greater potential for reverse sensitivity effects that may affect the ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrade of Z facilities which are a physical resource that must be managed under the Act.  Several of Z Energy's service stations either directly adjoin or are located in close proximity. The proposed changes to the residential zone provisions and consequential increase in development potential on these surrounding sites have the potential to generate reverse sensitivity effects including nuisance effects (e.g. noise, lighting and odour displacement) and amenity effects. For instance, an occupier on a third storey apartment building is more likely to perceive noise and visual effects compared to an occupier of single storey dwelling which is less elevated and, more than likely, screened by a fence and landscaping. [Refer to original submission, including table of Z sites]	Amend MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows:  Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development:  1. Fulfils the intent of the Residential Design Guide; 2. Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants; 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site. 5. <u>Manages reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities.</u>	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.155	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / MRZP6	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the decision sought relating to recognition of reverse sensitivity in matters of discretion due to potential impacts on residential intensification.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.271	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support in part	Policy MRZ-P6 is supported, but amendment is sought.	Retain Policy MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.272	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that multi-unit housing should be appropriately designed and insulated to mitigate noise effects from the existing environment in the interests of the human health of occupants. Considers that commercial activities should be encouraged and supported where appropriate and integrated with residential development.	Amend Policy MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows: Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development: ... 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.; <u>and</u> 5. <u>Where located in proximity to legally established activities that emit noise (such as State Highways), buildings for noise sensitive activities are designed to mitigate noise and vibration effects to occupants.</u> 6. <u>For higher density developments, options to incorporate mixed-uses such as commercial activities have been explored.</u>	Reject.	No.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.117	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support in part	MRZ-P6 is partially supported, but amendments are required for proposed residential developments that adjoin or are in close proximity to lawfully established non-residential activities where reverse sensitivity effects might occur.	Retain MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) with amendment.	Reject.	No.



## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.118	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P6 should be amended to better protect larger-scale and higher-density residential developments where they have been appropriately designed to manage reverse sensitivity where there is an interface with a Commercial or Mixed-Use Zone, or with lawfully established non-residential activities. Amendments are required for proposed residential developments that adjoin or are in close proximity to lawfully established non-residential activities where reverse sensitivity effects might occur. The following relief appropriately gives effect to design principle 1(c): 'The Site' of the National Medium Density Design Guide (Ministry for the Environment, May 2022) which encourages new development to respond to existing or proposed nearby non-residential activities.	Amend MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows:  Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development: 1. Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide; 2. Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants; 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and 4. Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site. 5. <u>Manages reverse sensitivity effects on existing lawfully established non-residential activities.</u>	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.48	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ – P6	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought due to potential impacts on the scale of residential intensification.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.15	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in these submission points as reverse sensitivity should be managed through appropriate setback provisions rather than requiring activities contemplated in the zone to manage the effects of activities outside the zone.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.15	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in these submission points as reverse sensitivity should be managed through appropriate setback provisions rather than requiring activities contemplated in the zone to manage the effects of activities outside the zone.	Disallow	Accept	No.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Amend	Considers that the collection of waste from multi-unit housing sites needs the waste storage areas to be accessed by rubbish trucks or conveniently walked to the kerb for pickup. Specific consideration of the accessibility of waste collection by collection trucks needs to be ensured.	Seeks that specific consideration of the accessibility of waste collection by collection truck be ensured in MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing).	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.323	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Amend	Notes that an effect of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill is that more development is enabled further away from the City, with the bulk of Wellington's residential areas now zoned 'medium density'. To help mitigate this, the submitter seeks that there also be a need to ensure multi-unit developments reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle when considered for consenting.	Amend MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) to add an additional point, as follows:  " <u>Reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle</u> "	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.340	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Oppose in part	MRZ-P6 is opposed and amendments are sought.	Opposes MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.341	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Amend	<p>Considers that MRZ-P6 should be amended to delete 'multi-unit housing' as a separate activity type from stand-alone houses or any other residential typology for the purposes of the zone rules and standards. Residential development should be considered on the basis of its effects and merits rather than specifically on typology or the scale/collective number of dwellings.</p> <p>The policy should therefore provide for residential activity beyond the permitted activity status and a framework that includes the outcome that the District Plan is seeking to achieve. Amendments are sought to the policy to allow reference to more than three residential units on a site as these are managed through a resource consent process.</p> <p>The direct reference to the design guide should be removed, as design guides should be removed from the Plan and treated as a nonstatutory tool outside of the District Plan. Amendments are therefore sought to articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought and to recognise changing amenity in accordance with the NPS-UD.</p> <p>If the Council does not provide the relief sought, in deleting the design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, it is sought that the design guidelines are 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. Kāinga Ora seeks the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows:</p> <p><del>Multi-unit housing</del> <u>Higher density residential development</u></p> <p>Provide for <del>multi-unit housing more than three residential units per site</del> where it can be demonstrated that the development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide;</del> <u>Achieves the following urban design outcomes:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Provides an effective public private interface;</del></li> <li><del>The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</del></li> <li><del>Provides high quality buildings;</del></li> <li><del>Responds to the natural environment.</del></li> </ol> </li> <li>Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants;</li> <li>Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and</li> <li><del>Is adequately able to be</del> <u>serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.</u></li> </ol> <p><u>Note: Best practice urban design guidance is contained within Council's Design Guidelines.</u></p>	Accept in part.	Yes.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.133	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ P6	Oppose	Considers the signalled direction in the introduction would be more enabling than MDRS requirements without adequate justification.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.28	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Oppose	The submission to remove reference to the Design guide is opposed, along with amendments to multi unit housing requirements. This form of housing requires special scrutiny to ensure it fits with the community and local environment.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.27	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Oppose	The submission to remove reference to the Design guide is opposed, along with amendments to multi unit housing requirements. This form of housing requires special scrutiny to ensure it fits with the community and local environment.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.70	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Amend	<p>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.</p> <p>The Residential Design Guide should be non-statutory. [Refer to submission points made on 'Design Guides' and HRZ – P6].</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure should not limit housing development. It should just be a question of cost.</p> <p>[Refer to submission points made on SCA-O1 –SCA-O6].</p>	<p>Delete clause 1 and 4 of MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as follows:</p> <p>Multi-unit housing</p> <p>Provide for multi-unit housing where it can be demonstrated that the development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide;</del></li> <li>Provides a minimum area of private or shared outdoor living space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of future occupants;</li> <li>Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; and</li> <li><del>Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.</del></li> </ol>	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.253	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	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.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.253	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	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.	No.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.74	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P6	Support	Supports MRZ-P6 as enabling the collection of all kinds of waste, this will be beneficial in reducing waste pollution and enable more sustainable living.	Retain MRZ-P6 (Multi-unit housing) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.172	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for multi-unit housing and retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development can be adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure, or can address any constraints on the site.	Retain MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Kilmarnock Developments Limited and Kilmarnock Properties Limited	290.57	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P7 (Retirement Villages) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.116	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Oppose in part	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific policy in the Proposed Plan; however, considers that some of the clauses of this policy are inappropriate for the reasons set out in this submission, including that they conflict with the MDRS. References Clause 1 of MRZ-P7 seeks to 'fulfil the intent of the Residential Design Guide' - 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). Considers that the 'intent' of the Residential Design Guide is not identified within the Proposed Plan, or the Design Guide itself, and as such no guidance is provided as to how to measure a development against this intent. Considers high quality developments can be encouraged through other mechanisms. It is noted that an additional clause (Clause 5 –consistency of intensity, scale and design with zone amenity values) is applicable to the retirement village policy (MRZ-P7) to those applicable to multi-unit housing (MRZ-P6). Considers that recognising that retirement villages and multiunit housing developments are assessed against the same provisions in many places throughout the Proposed Plan, and that they can be and frequently are constructed at similar scales, it is unclear why retirement villages are subject to additional provisions. The RVA considers this clause is inconsistent with the MDRS and should be deleted. Considers that MRZ-P7 does not appropriately provide for / recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, and that they may require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services, and have unique layouts and internal amenity needs to cater to the needs of residents.	Opposes MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.117	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Amend	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific policy in the Proposed Plan; however, considers that some of the clauses of this policy are inappropriate for the reasons set out in this submission, including that they conflict with the MDRS. References Clause 1 of MRZ-P7 seeks to 'fulfil the intent of the Residential Design Guide' - 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). Considers that the 'intent' of the Residential Design Guide is not identified within the Proposed Plan, or the Design Guide itself, and as such no guidance is provided as to how to measure a development against this intent. Considers high quality developments can be encouraged through other mechanisms. It is noted that an additional clause (Clause 5 –consistency of intensity, scale and design with zone amenity values) is applicable to the retirement village policy (MRZ-P7) to those applicable to multi-unit housing (MRZ-P6). Considers that recognising that retirement villages and multiunit housing developments are assessed against the same provisions in many places throughout the Proposed Plan, and that they can be and frequently are constructed at similar scales, it is unclear why retirement villages are subject to additional provisions. The RVA considers this clause is inconsistent with the MDRS and should be deleted. Considers that MRZ-P7 does not appropriately provide for / recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, and that they may require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services, and have unique layouts and internal amenity needs to cater to the needs of residents.	Amend MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) as follows: <del>Provide for retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development:</del> <del>1. Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide;</del> <del>2. Includes outdoor space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of the residents of the village;</del> <del>3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development;</del> <del>4. is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site;</del> <del>and</del> <del>5. is of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone.</del> <u>1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages.</u> <u>2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u> <u>a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u> <u>b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u>	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.273	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Support in part	Policy MRZ-P7 is supported, but amendment is sought.	Retain Policy MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Waka Kotahi	370.274	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Amend	Considers that multi-unit housing should be appropriately designed and insulated to mitigate noise effects from the existing environment in the interests of the human health of occupants. Considers that commercial activities should be encouraged and supported where appropriate and integrated with residential development including retirement villages. Considers that retirement villages should be suitably located to ensure that they are not car-centric developments. Consideration of location, access to services for residents with varying degrees of mobility should be included in any development proposal.	Amend Policy MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) as follows: Provide for retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development: ... 5. Is of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone; and 6. <u>Is suitably located and designed to enable multi-modal connectivity; and</u> 7. <u>Where located in proximity to legally established activities that emit noise (such as State Highways), buildings for noise sensitive activities are designed to mitigate noise and vibration effects to occupants.</u>	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.214	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Not specified	The RVA does not oppose the submission point under (6) in principle, but due to the unique functional and operational needs of retirement villages, The RVA considers that the relief sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Disallow submission point relating to MRZ-P7 (6), and allow relief sought by The RVA in relation to MRZ-P7 in its primary submission.	Accept in part.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.214	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Not specified	Ryman does not oppose the submission point under (6) in principle, but due to the unique functional and operational needs of retirement villages, Ryman considers that the relief sought should not apply to retirement villages.	Amend / Disallow submission point relating to MRZ-P7 (6), and allow relief sought by Ryman in relation to MRZ-P7 in its primary submission.	Accept in part.	No.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.119	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Amend	Considers that the collection of waste from retirement villages needs the waste storage areas to be accessed by rubbish trucks or conveniently walked to the kerb for pickup. Specific consideration of the accessibility of waste collection by collection trucks needs to be ensured.	Seeks that specific consideration of the accessibility of waste collection by collection trucks be ensured in MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages).	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.342	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Support in part	MRZ-P7 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) with amendment.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.343	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P7 should be amended to remove direct reference to the design guide, as design guides should be removed from the Plan and treated as a non-statutory tool outside of the District Plan. Amendments are therefore sought to articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought and to recognise changing amenity in accordance with the NPSUD. If the Council does not provide the relief sought, in deleting the design guidelines and references to such guidelines in the District Plan, Kāinga Ora seeks that the design guidelines are 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. Kāinga Ora seek the opportunity to review these guidelines if they are to remain a statutory document.	Amend MRZ-P7 (Retirement villages) as follows:  Provide for retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development:  1. <u>Fulfills the intent of the Residential Design Guide; Achieves the following urban design outcomes:</u> <u>a. Provides an effective public private interface;</u> <u>b. The scale, form and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u> <u>c. Provides high quality buildings;</u> <u>d. Responds to the natural environment.</u> 2. Includes outdoor space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of the residents of the village; 3. Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development; 4. <u>Is adequately able to be serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site; and</u> 5. Is of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values anticipated <u>and planned built form</u> for the Zone.  <u>Note: Best practice urban design guidance is contained within Council's Design Guidelines.</u>	Accept in part.	Yes.
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.25	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Disallow / Seeks that the improved design guides in the Proposed District Plan as notified are retained.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.134	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Oppose	The RVA supports the intent of the policy and agrees with the removal of the design guides, however The RVA opposes the submission point seeking to include new urban design outcomes. It is not clear what 'responds to the natural environment' is intended to entail, and the new outcomes are inconsistent with the relief sought in The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.134	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Oppose	Ryman supports the intent of the policy and agrees with the removal of the design guides, however Ryman opposes the submission point seeking to include new urban design outcomes. It is not clear what 'responds to the natural environment' is intended to entail, and the new outcomes are inconsistent with the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.23	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Support in part	Supports the provision of a specific policy for retirement villages.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.	Reject.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.24	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P7	Support in part	<p>As retirement villages have particular functional and operational needs which drive their built form it is appropriate to recognise and provide for this.</p> <p>However, Metlifecare seeks amendments to the policy for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The policy provides for retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the village "fulfils the intent of the Residential Design Guide". Metlifecare opposes this requirement for the following reasons:</li> </ul> <p>(a) The Residential Design Guide does not refer to retirement village development or particular design intentions in relation to these villages. It is therefore difficult to determine how the Design Guide can be applied or how the criteria could be satisfied.</p> <p>(b) It is not appropriate for retirement village developments to be required to align with design goals that apply to residential development more generally because it fails to recognise the differing functional and operational needs of retirement villages.</p> <p>(c) It is also unclear what "fulfils the intent" of the design guide means, particularly in the context where there is no direct reference to retirement villages in the guide.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requiring retirement villages to be of an intensity, scale and design that is "consistent" with the amenity values anticipated for the zone is unnecessarily restrictive and does not recognise the functional and operational needs of a retirement village. In addition, as a retirement village site is often a larger site, there is an opportunity to provide more intensive development while avoiding adverse amenity effects on adjoining properties. The effects arising from exceedance of any of the relevant standards will be considered as part of any application for resource consent (as a restricted discretionary activity).</li> <li>Metlifecare also considers that the policy should refer to the functional and operational needs of retirement villages to ensure that the particular needs of this type of development are recognised in this zone. This is consistent with Metlifecare's proposals in relation to strategic directions (above).</li> </ul>	<p>Amend MRS-P7 (Retirement villages) as follows:</p> <p>Retirement villages</p> <p>Provide for retirement villages where it can be demonstrated that the development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Fulfils the intent of the Residential Design Guide;</del></li> <li>Includes outdoor space that is sufficient to cater for the needs of the residents of the village;</li> <li>Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for the management, storage and collection of all waste, recycling and organic waste potentially generated by the development;</li> <li>Is adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site; and</li> <li><del>Is of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent in keeping with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone.</del></li> </ol> <p><u>Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</del></li> <li><del>Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</del></li> </ol>	Reject.	No.
Leeanne Templer	206.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P8	Amend	<p>Considers that MRZ does not contribute positively to a safe and accessible living environment, or positively to a changing urban environment or achieve attractive and safe streets (Per MRZ-P8) on Rama Crescent.</p> <p>Considers that Rama Crescent does not have the infrastructure for further intensification.</p> <p>Considers that there is a need to retain existing covenants on titles in Rama Crescent which protect views.</p> <p>Considers that there needs to be provision for onsite parking in Rama Crescent because public transport can't enter and walking is tough.</p> <p>Considers that ambassadorial residences on the street require privacy and further stories and intensification would compromise this.</p>	Seeks that the application of MRZ-P8 (Residential Buildings and Structures) is amended so Rama Crescent and the streets above it are excluded from building height increases and intensification.	Reject.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.173	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P8	Support	Supports the policy as it provides for a range of residential buildings and structures, including additions and alterations, that provide for healthy, safe and accessible living environments.	Retain MRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) as notified.	Reject.	No.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.58	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P8	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) as notified.	Reject	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.118	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P8	Oppose in part	Considers it is not clear whether MRZ-P8 applies to retirement villages, given MRZ-P7 is a more specific policy. The RVA seeks that this policy does not apply to retirement villages.	Opposes MRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.119	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P8	Amend	Considers it is not clear whether MRZ-P8 applies to retirement villages, given MRZ-P7 is a more specific policy. The RVA seeks that this policy does not apply to retirement villages.	Amend MRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) to clarify that it does not apply to retirement villages.	Reject.	No.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.120	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P8	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) as notified.	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.324	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P8	Amend	Notes that an effect of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill is that more development is enabled further away from the City, with the bulk of Wellington's residential areas now zoned 'medium density'. To help mitigate this, the submitter seeks that there also be a need to ensure multi-unit developments reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle when considered for consenting.	Amend MRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) to add an additional point, as follows:  "Reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle"	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.344	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P8	Support	MRZ-P8 is generally supported.	Retain MRZ-P8 (Residential buildings and structures) as notified.	Reject.	No.
Trelissick Park Group	168.23	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P9	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P9 is too vague and should be amended to require at least neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development.	Amend MRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) to require neutral or lesser stormwater runoff, compared with pre-development.	Reject.	No.
Tyers Stream Group	221.72	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P9	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks amendment to MRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) so that the level of permeable surface should be proportionate to the extent of hard surface increase from the development.	Reject.	No.
Wellington City Council	266.132	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P9	Oppose in part	Considers that given this is not a building provision, but a three waters/infrastructure provision, it is more logical to locate this policy in the THW chapter. Note: MRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) and MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface) are to be relocated to THW – see new THW-P6 and THW-R7.	Delete MRZ-P9 (Permeable Surface) in its entirety. Consequential renumbering and amendments to updated policy references for MRZ-P10 to MRZ-P15 to reflect change in numbering.	Accept.	Yes.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.59	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P9	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) as notified.	Reject.	No.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.121	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P9	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) as notified.	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.325	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P9	Support	The policy will assist with reducing the rate and amount of storm water run-off.	Retain MRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) as notified.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.345	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P9	Support in part	MRZ-P9 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.346	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P9	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P9 should be amended to relate to sufficient permeable surface provision rather than a minimum. There may be instances where stormwater runoff effects can be mitigated by a lower level of permeable surface area and the policy should recognise this.	Amend MRZ-P9 (Permeable surface) as follows:  Require development to provide a <u>minimum level of sufficient permeable surface area</u> to assist with reducing the rate and amount of storm water run-off.	Reject.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	F584.88	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P9	Oppose	Greater Wellington support the requirement for minimum permeable surface area and consider 'sufficient' to be too uncertain. We also note that multi-unit housing is excluded from HRZ-S10 and MRZ-S10 which the submitter supports. Amending the policy for all development is therefore not necessary.	Disallow / Seeks that the policy is retained as notified.	Reject.	No.
Tyers Stream Group	221.73	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Amend	Considers that new 'landscaping' should be required, not just 'sought'.	Amend MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as follows:  Encourage the retention of existing vegetation, particularly native vegetation and visually prominent trees that may not otherwise be protected, and where vegetation is proposed to be removed, seek <u>require</u> new landscaping of equal or better quality to help integrate new development into the surrounding environment and minimise hard surfacing.	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.174	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Support in part	Supports the policy as it takes account of vegetation removal as a measure for the preventative mitigation of fire risk to property and life. It is important that property owners and occupiers are able to remove flammable vegetation, as required, to provide sufficient clearance to mitigate the potential for fire risk/spread between flammable vegetation and property	Support MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping), with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.175	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Amend	Supports the policy as it takes account of vegetation removal as a measure for the preventative mitigation of fire risk to property and life. It is important that property owners and occupiers are able to remove flammable vegetation, as required, to provide sufficient clearance to mitigate the potential for fire risk/spread between flammable vegetation and property	Amend MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as follows:  Encourage the retention of existing vegetation, particularly native vegetation and visually prominent trees that may not otherwise be protected, <u>except where it poses fire risk to the environment and the health and safety of people</u> , and where vegetation is proposed to be removed, seek new landscaping of equal or better quality to help integrate new development into the surrounding environment and minimise hard surfacing\.	Reject.	No.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.60	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Hilary Watson	321.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Amend	Considers that Newtown's vegetation and trees, including in private backyards, should be preserved as they are essential connectors for birdlife between the city's flourishing green belts and Zealandia. The trees on private properties and in parks also act as the components of the natural sump system in times of flooding, and prevent surface water runoff. The established Doctor Margaret Stanley also proposed a 30-300 rule, which states everyone should be able to see three trees from their house, every neighbourhood should have a 30 percent tree canopy and everyone should live less than 300 meters away from a green space.	Amend MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as follows:  <u>To</u> encourage the retention of existing vegetation, particularly native vegetation and visually prominent trees that may not otherwise be protected, and where vegetation is proposed to be removed, seek new landscaping of equal or better quality to help integrate new development into the surrounding environment and minimise hard surfacing.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.120	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Oppose in part	Considers that the requirement to provide "equal or better quality" vegetation where existing vegetation is removed is unlikely to be feasible alongside residential intensification.	Opposes MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) and seeks amendment to encourage new landscaping but delete reference to "equal or better quality".	Reject.	No.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.122	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as notified.	Accept.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.326	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Support	The policy will assist with reducing unnecessary loss of vegetation, with benefits to biodiversity, pleasantness and amenity, as well as helping reduce the rate and amount of storm water run-off.	Retain MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Director-General of Conservation	385.81	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Support	Supports the use of policy which encourages the retention of existing vegetation (including native vegetation) that would otherwise be unprotected under the Proposed District Plan.	Retain MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.347	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Oppose	MRZ-P10 is opposed as it may have the effect of applying blanket protections to non-indigenous vegetation and therefore seeks the deletion of this policy.	Delete MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.25	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Oppose	Supports the provision of high quality landscaping to enhance the built environment, however the proposed policy MRZ-P10 goes much further than this, and is likely to be counter to the requirement in the NPS-UD to enable intensification.	Seeks to delete MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping).	Reject.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.26	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P10	Oppose	Supports the provision of high quality landscaping to enhance the built environment, however the proposed policy MRZ-P10 goes much further than this, and is likely to be counter to the requirement in the NPS-UD to enable intensification.	Seeks add amend MRZ-P10 (Vegetation and landscaping) to add as follows:  <u>Encourage the provision and maintenance of landscaping to enhance the built environment.</u>	Reject.	No.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.61	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P11	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.121	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P11	Support	Supports MRZ-P11 as it aligns with Policy 3 of the MDRS.	Retain MRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.	Accept.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Waka Kotahi	370.275	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P11	Support	Policy MRZ-P11 is supported.	Retain MRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.	Accept.	No.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.123	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P11	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.	Accept.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.327	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P11	Support	The policy will assist with improving liveability and attractiveness - designing for safety is highly important in built environments.	Retain MRZ-P11 (Attractive and safe streets and public open spaces) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Prime Property Group	256.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P12	Oppose	<p>Spenmoor area defined in the district plan restricts any multi residential development in this area by seeking further assessments with respect to traffic.</p> <p>Considers that the street is no worse than others in Newlands that do not have a specific policy focussed on traffic effects and roading capacity.</p> <p>Works are scheduled which negate the need for the policy and further assessment of traffic effects</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Delete provision MRZ-P12 (Roading capacity in the Spenmoor Street Area).	Accept.	Yes.
Waka Kotahi	370.276	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P12	Support	Policy MRZ-P12 is supported.	Retain MRZ-P12 (Roading capacity in the Spenmoor Street Area) as notified.	Reject	No.
Prime Property Group	F593.4	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZP12	Oppose	<p>Roading improvements in this area are planned by Prime Property Group.</p> <p>Prime Property Group considers that this road also does not significantly differ than the surrounding areas where no specific roading reports are required. It is also worth noting that Waka Kotahi are not requiring other similar streets to have their roading capacity identified before a subdivision/development can occur.</p>	Disallow	Accept.	Yes.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.124	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P12	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P12 (Roading capacity in the Spenmoor Street Area) as notified.	Reject.	Yes.
Rongotai Investments Ltd	F593.1	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZP12	Oppose	Considers that there is no given reason to why the original submitters support the given provision. Roading improvements in this area are planned by Prime Property Group. This road also does not significantly differ than the surrounding areas where no specific roading reports are required.	Disallow / Remove the Spenmoor Street area provision	Accept.	Yes.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.348	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P12	Support in part	MRZ-P12 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-P12 (Roading capacity in the Spenmoor Street Area) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Prime Property Group	F593.2	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZP12	Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports the Spenmoor Street Roading Provisions. Roading improvements in this area are planned by Prime Property Group. Prime Property Group considers that this road also does not significantly differ than the surrounding areas where no specific roading reports are required.	Disallow / Remove the Spenmoor Street area provision	Accept.	Yes.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.349	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P12	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P12 should be amended to delete the reference to 'multi-unit housing' consistent with the rest of the submission.	<p>Amend MRZ-P12 (Roading capacity in the Spenmoor Street Area) as follows:</p> <p>Only allow multi-unit housing more than three residential units per site where it can be demonstrated that the local roading network has the capacity to accommodate any increase in traffic associated with the new development, and that the safety and efficiency of the roading network will be maintained.</p>	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.134	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ P12	Oppose	Considers the signalled direction in the introduction would be more enabling than MDRS requirements without adequate justification.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Prime Property Group	F593.3	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZP12	Oppose	Kāinga Ora supports the Spenmoor Street Roading Provisions. Roading improvements in this area are planned by Prime Property Group. Prime Property Group considers that this road also does not significantly differ than the surrounding areas where no specific roading reports are required.	Disallow / Remove the Spenmoor Street area provision	Accept.	Yes.



Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.32	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P13	Support in part	Supports (in large) the inclusion of a provision which directs the development of their land, but would like it amended to be more enabling for the anticipated use of the land.	Retain MRZ-P13 (Tapu Te Ranga), but seeks amendment	Accept in part.	No.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.33	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P13	Amend	Supports (in large) the inclusion of a provision which directs the development of their land, but would like it amended to be more enabling for the anticipated use of the land.	Amend MRZ-P13 (Tapu Te Ranga) as follows:  Facilitate Enable the integrated development of the Tapu Te Ranga land in a manner that: 1. Identifies and appropriately addresses any geo-technical and contamination issues; 2. Incorporates planting and landscaping to provide visual screening and integrate development into the surrounding environment; and 3. Fulfils the intent of the Residential Design Guide and Papakāinga Design Guide where relevant and applicable; and 4. Supports the long-term development aspirations for the site including Nohokāinga/Papakāinga, Marae, Urupā extension, Kāinga, and community buildings.	Accept in part.	Yes.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.125	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P13	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P13 (Tapu Te Ranga) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.93	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P13	Amend	Seeks clarification of the use of papakāinga.	Amend MRZ-P13 (Tapu Te Ranga) to the following: ..... 3. Fulfils the intent of the Residential Design Guide and Papakāinga Design Guide where relevant and applicable.  [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.350	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P13	Support in part	MRZ-P13 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-P13 (Tapu Te Ranga) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.351	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P13	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P13 should be amended to delete Design Guides within the District Plan. Kāinga Ora considers Design Guides to be too broad to be used as an assessment matter. A limited range of design criteria should be utilised instead and the focus for assessment should be effects beyond those anticipated by the zone in accordance with Policy 6 of the NPSUD.	Amend MRZ-P13 (Tapu Te Ranga) to delete reference to the Residential Design Guide and Papakāinga Design Guide and replace with the key design principles from these guides.	Reject.	No.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	F5138.82	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P13	Oppose	The submitter seeks for MRZ-P13 to be amended so that design guides, including the papakāinga design guide, are deleted from the plan. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira oppose this submission because design guides developed by tangata whenua are key mechanisms to give effect to cultural values, visions and tikanga. There is a need for design guides specific to each iwi to be reflected throughout Te Whanganui a Tara.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.75	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P13	Support in part	Supports reference to papakainga design guide.	Retain MRZ-P13 (Tapu Te Ranga) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.126	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P14	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P14 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P14	Support	MRZ-P14 is supported as it will encourage the diversion of waste appropriately. The definition for community gardens does not allow for composting of food waste specifically, which may preclude the undertaking of food waste composting.	Retain MRZ-P14 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified.	Accept.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.328	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P14	Support	Considers that the policy will help compensate for residents having less available green space, and provide for community building and public health, as well as potential infrastructure for green waste recycling at a local scale.	Retain MRZ-P14 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.352	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P14	Support	MRZ-P14 is generally supported.	Retain MRZ-P14 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified.	Accept.	No.
VicLabour	414.29	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P14	Support	Supports provision for community gardens and urban agriculture and considers a green city and more community spaces is needed.	Retain MRZ-P14 (Community gardens, urban agriculture and waste minimisation) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Avryl Bramley	202.38	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Oppose	Considers that this provision is too wide and allows commercial usage creep.	Delete MRZ-P15 (Non residential activities and buildings) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.176	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Support	Supports the policy as it enables non-residential activities and buildings that support the needs of the local communities which provide for emergency service facilities to locate in this zone. This policy also supports non-residential activities that maintain the safety of the transport network and are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure	Retain MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Amend	Considers that Non-residential activities (being activities already contemplated by the zone by way of restricted discretionary or discretionary activities, or ones that infringe the zone standards) should be able to be accommodated in the zone if they can demonstrate the requirements of the policy.	Amend MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows: <del>Only</del> Allow non-residential activities and buildings that:  1. Support the needs of local communities; 2. Are of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone; 3. Contribute positively to the urban environment and achieve attractive and safe streets; 4. Reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle; 5. Maintain the safety and efficiency of the transport network; and 6. Are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.62	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Support	Supports the appropriate Medium Density Residential Zoning of their land.	Retain MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Paihihara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.40	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Paihihara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.41	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P15 should be amended, as multi-unit housing and other non-residential activities and building cannot require car parking as set out in the NPS-UD. Developments should provide adequate and appropriately located cycle and micromobility parking to align with infrastructure and transport objectives in the PDP.	Amend MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows:  Only allow non-residential activities and buildings that: ... 6. Are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site. 7. <u>Provides an adequate and appropriately located area on site for cycle and micromobility parking and charging;</u> 8. <u>Adequate cycle facilities are accessible, secure, and covered (protected from weather) by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.</u>	Reject.	No.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.41	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P15 should be amended to clarify wording relative to the discretionary activity status of various non-residential activities and buildings provided for within the Medium Density Residential zone as restricted discretionary activities, and the provision of all other activities as discretionary activities.	Amend MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows: <del>Only a</del> Allow non-residential activities and buildings that:  1. Support the needs of local communities; 2. Are of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values anticipated for the Zone; 3. Contribute positively to the urban environment and achieve attractive and safe streets; 4. Reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle; 5. Maintain the safety and efficiency of the transport network; <del>and</del> 6. Are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site; 7. <u>Can demonstrate an operational or functional need to locate within the zone.</u>	Accept in part.	Yes.
Waka Kotahi	370.277	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Support in part	Policy MRZ-P15 is supported, but amendment is sought.	Retain Policy MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) and seeks amendment.	Accept.	Yes.
Waka Kotahi	370.278	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Amend	Considers that mixed-use activities should be encouraged in MRZ-P15 and supported where appropriate and integrated with residential development.	Amend Policy MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows: Only allow non-residential activities and buildings that: ... 5. Maintain the safety and efficiency of the transport network; <del>and</del> 6. Are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site; <del>and</del> 7. <u>Are integrated into residential developments where possible.</u>	Accept.	Yes.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.127	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.329	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Support	The policy will help enable facilities and services that support urban living.	Retain MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.353	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Support in part	MRZ-P15 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) with amendment.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.89	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Oppose	Greater Wellington support the requirement for minimum permeable surface area and consider 'sufficient' to be too uncertain. We also note that multi-unit housing is excluded from HRZ-S10 and MRZ-S10 which the submitter supports. Amending the policy for all development is therefore not necessary.	Disallow / Seeks that the policy is retained as notified.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.354	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Amend	Considers that MRZ-P15 should be amended to clarify that servicing may change as a result of development. Changes are also sought to better recognise the intent of the NPS-UD (particularly Policy 6) that recognises the planned urban built form and that change to existing amenity is not in itself an adverse effect.	Amend MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows:  Only allow non-residential activities and buildings that:  1. Support the needs of local communities; 2. Are of an intensity, scale and design that is consistent with the amenity values anticipated and planned built form for the Zone; 3. Contribute positively to the urban environment and achieve attractive and safe streets; 4. Reduce reliance on travel by private motor vehicle; 5. Maintain the safety and efficiency of the transport network; and 6. Are adequately able to be serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Ministry of Education	400.94	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Support in part	Supports MRZ-P15 in part as it provides for non-residential activities in the MRZ.	Retain MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Ministry of Education	400.95	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-P15	Amend	Seeks MRZ-P15 be amended to ensure that additional infrastructure (including educational facilities) are explicitly recognised and provided for within the MRZ.	Amend MRZ-P15 (Non-residential activities and buildings) as follows:  Only allow non-residential activities and buildings that: ... 6. Are adequately serviced by three waters infrastructure or can address any constraints on the site. 7. Provides additional infrastructure to support the needs of the community.	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.284	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-P1	Not specified	[Submitter has provided a neutral position on this provision]  Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-P1 (Managing development) subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.361	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-P1	Oppose	MRZ-PREC03-P1 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-P1 (Managing development) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.72	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ PREC03-P1	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.61	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-P1	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-P1 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form.  The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-P1 (Managing development) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R1	Amend	Considers #64 Kelburn Parade should have provision for non-residential activities on the ground floor because it is close to the university.  [See original submission for full details]	Seeks that provision is made for small scale non-residential activity on the ground floor of 64 Kelburn Parade.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.336	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R1	Support	Considers that the rule will help compensate for residents having less available green space, and provide for community building and public health, as well as potential infrastructure for green waste recycling at a local scale.	Retain MRZ-R1 (Community gardens) as notified.	Accept.	No.
VicLabour	414.31	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R1	Support	Supports provision for community gardens and urban agriculture and considers a green city and more community spaces is needed.	Retain MRZ-R1 (Community gardens) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept.	No.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Support	Considers that the permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama; i.e. people living in a residential situation, who are subject to support and/or supervision by Ara Poutama.	Retain MRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.34	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Support	Supports the inclusion of this rule and recognition of Tapu-te-Ranga land and the identification of specific matters relevant to the development of the site. These matters are all relevant and are addressed individually above.	Retain MRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.185	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Amend	Considers that on the basis the National Grid is a qualifying matter, MRZ-R2 should be amended to clarify activities subject to the rule are subject to the qualifying matter area provisions. Considers the note would assist with plan interpretation and application.	Amend Rule MRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as follows:  MRZ-R2 Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses  1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. No more than three residential units occupy the site, except in MRZ-PREC03 where there is no limit. 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with MRZ-R2.1.a cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P5 and MRZ P6; 2. For any site within the Spenmoor Street Area: the matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P5, MRZ-P6 and MRZ-P12; and 3. For the Tapu Te Ranga land: the matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P5, MRZ-P6 and MRZ-P13.  Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R2.2.a is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified. Note:  <u>Activities subject to MRZ-R2 shall comply with, and are subject to, the relevant provisions for qualifying matter areas.</u>	Reject.	No.
Khoi Phan	326.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend MRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as follows:  1. Activity status: Permitted  Where:  a. No more than <del>three</del> <u>six</u> residential units occupy the site, except in MRZ-PREC03 where there is no limit.	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.285	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Support	Rule MRZ-R2 is supported.	Retain MRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.337	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Support	Considers that MRZ-R2 will help enable facilities and services that are suited to a residential setting.	Retain MRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.362	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Support in part	MRZ-R2 is partially supported but amendments are sought.	Retain MRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) with amendment.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.363	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R2 should be amended so that changes can be made to provide for better clarity in regard to the intention of the rule and notification preclusions.	Amend MRZ-R2.1 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted where: a. No more than three residential units occupy the site; <del>and, except in MRZ-PREC03 where there is no limit.</del> <u>b. Compliance with the following standards is achieved:</u> i. <u>MRZ-S1;</u> ii. <u>MRZ-S3;</u> iii. <u>MRZ-S4 only in relation to the rear/side yard boundary setback;</u> iv. <u>MRZ-S5;</u> v. <u>MRZ-S7.</u>	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.364	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R2 should be amended so that changes can be made to provide for better clarity in regard to the intention of the rule and notification preclusions. An additional Restricted Discretionary activity status is proposed.	Amend MRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as follows:  <u>2. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary where compliance with MRZ-R1.a. cannot be achieved.</u>  <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u> <u>2. The development contributes to a safe and attractive public realm and streetscape;</u> <u>3. The extent and effects on the three waters infrastructure, achieved by demonstrating that at the point of connection the infrastructure has the capacity to service the development.</u> <u>4. The degree to which development delivers quality on-site amenity and occupant privacy that is appropriate for its scale; and</u>  <u>where compliance with MRZ-R1.b. cannot be achieved.</u> <u>5. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard.</u>	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.365	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R2 should be amended so that changes can be made to provide for better clarity in regard to the intention of the rule and notification preclusions. An additional Notification status is proposed.	Amend MRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) as follows: ... <u>Notification status:</u> <u>1. An application for resource consent which complies with MRZ-R1.a. but does not comply with MRZR1.b. is precluded from being publicly notified.</u> <u>2. An application for resource consent made which does not comply with MRZ-R1.a. but complies with MRZ-R1.b. is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u> <u>3. An application for resource consent made which does not comply with MRZ-R1.a. and MRZ-R1.b. but complies with MRZ-S1 and MRZ-S5 is precluded from being either publicly notified.</u>	Reject.	No.
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.29	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend MRZ-R2 (Residential Activities...) to make it clear that the Restricted Discretionary provisions are only available in the Townscape Precincts if the burden of proof is placed with the developer, in respect to MRZ-P2 (Housing Supply and Choice) and MRZ-P3 (Housing Needs).	Reject.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R2	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents.  Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R2 (Residential activities, excluding retirement villages, supported residential care activities and boarding houses) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.286	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Support in part	Submitter supports the permitted activity standards for home business as it limits potential traffic effects on the roading network. Submitter also supports the restricted discretionary activity status for where the standards are not met.	Retain Rule MRZ-R3 (Home business) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.287	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Amend	Submitter has sought changes to standards that apply to the permitted rule of MRZ-R3.	Seeks to amend Rule MRZ-R3.1 (Home business) to align with requested changes to the referenced standards in the rule.	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.338	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Support	Considers that MRZ-R3 will help enable businesses that are suited to a residential setting.	Retain MRZ-R3 (Home business) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.366	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Support in part	MRZ-R3 is generally supported, particularly the preclusion of public notification but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-R3 (Home business) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.367	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R3 should be amended to recognise changing urban environments and amenity in accordance with the NPSUD.	Amend MRZ-R3.2 (Home business) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity adversely impacts on the <u>planned urban built form</u> amenity values of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood. 2. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity adversely impacts on the amenity values of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood. ...	Reject.	No.
Onslow Residents Community Association	F580.30	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ R3	Oppose	Considers amenity is important and must be retained.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents.  Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R3 (Home business) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.	Reject.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Support in part	Supports MRZ-R3 (Home business) facilitating individuals being able to conduct a business from their principal place of residence.	Retain Supports MRZ-R3 (Home business) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R3 (Home business) should be amended to reduce the proposed numbers working and those visiting as they are out of proportion to a home-based business.  Considers that the MRZ-R3 exception to exclusive residential use needs to be tailored to small and non-intrusive ventures that can be readily monitored. The right of neighbours to have quiet enjoyment at all times needs to be upheld as having paramount importance.	Amend MRZ-R3.1.b. (Home Business) as follows: ... b. No more than <del>four</del> <u>three</u> people in total work in the home business at any one time, and the maximum number of people on site associated with the home business does not exceed <del>10</del> <u>6</u> people at any one time;	Reject.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that the HRZ-R3 exception to exclusive residential use needs to be tailored to small and non-intrusive ventures that can be readily monitored. The right of neighbours to have quiet enjoyment at all times needs to be upheld as having paramount importance.	Seeks that MRZ-R3 (Home Business) is amended to include the mandatory notification and consultation provisions of the Prostitution Reform Act 2003 need to be added as a caveat.	Reject.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that the MRZ-R3 exception to exclusive residential use needs to be tailored to small and non-intrusive ventures that can be readily monitored. The right of neighbours to have quiet enjoyment at all times needs to be upheld as having paramount importance.	Not specified.	Reject.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R3	Amend	Considers that the potential loss of tenancies for commercial property owners paying higher rates should be considered.	Seeks that MRZ-R3.2 (Home Business) is amended to include the potential loss of tenancies for commercial property owners paying higher rates as a matter of discretion [inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Oranga Tamariki	83.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Support	Oranga Tamariki support the Permitted activity status for supported residential care activities. It provides flexibility for Oranga Tamariki to establish homes (up to 10 residents) in residential zones.  Residential zones are considered an appropriate zone for Oranga Tamariki homes.	Retain MRZ-R4.1 (Supported residential care activities) as notified.	Reject.	Yes.
Oranga Tamariki	83.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Support	Oranga Tamariki support the Restricted Discretionary activity status for supported residential care activities exceeding 10 residents. Oranga Tamariki consider it acceptable for Council to consider the effects on the amenity values of the wider area as a result of the intensity and scale of the activity.  Oranga Tamariki also support the preclusion of public notification for supported residential care activities exceeding 10 residents.	Retain MRZ-R4.2 (Supported residential care activities) as notified.	Reject.	Yes.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that should Council see it as being absolutely necessary to implement the separate definition of "supported residential care activity", then Ara Poutama requests that the enabled activities policies and permitted land use activity rules applying to supported residential care activities in the Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Large Lot Residential and Corrections zones are retained as notified.</p> <p>The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the establishment and operation of supported and transitional accommodation activities. Such activities are an important component of the rehabilitation and reintegration process for people under Ara Poutama's supervision. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety.</p>	Retain MRZ-R4 (Supported residential care activities) as notified if "supported residential care activity" definition and references to term are retained.	Reject.	Yes.
Khoi Phan	326.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	<p>Amend MRZ-R4 (Supported residential care activities) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The maximum occupancy does not exceed <del>10</del> 20 residents.</p>	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.339	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Support	Considers that MRZ-R4 will help enable facilities and services that are suited to a residential setting.	Retain MRZ-R4 (Supported residential care activities) as notified.	Reject.	Yes.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.368	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Support in part	MRZ-R4 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-R4 (Supported residential care activities) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.369	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R4 should be amended to recognise changing urban environments and amenity in accordance with the NPS-UD, and to preclude both public and limited notification as the activity is residential in nature and anticipated within the zone.	<p>Amend MRZ-R4.2 (Supported residential care activities) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <p>1. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity adversely impacts on the <u>planned urban built form amenity values</u> of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood.</p> <p>Notification status:</p> <p>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R4.2.a is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</p>	Reject.	No.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.30	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Oppose	The proposal to delete the term 'amenity' from this point is opposed, along with all other attempts to remove 'amenity' from the Plan.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.29	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Oppose	The proposal to delete the term 'amenity' from this point is opposed, along with all other attempts to remove 'amenity' from the Plan.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R4	Oppose	<p>Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents.</p> <p>Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.</p>	Seeks that MRZ-R4 (Supported residential care activities) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.	Reject.	No.
Khoi Phan	326.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	<p>Amend MRZ-R5 (Boarding houses) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>a. The maximum occupancy does not exceed <del>10</del> 20 guests per night.</p>	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.340	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R5	Support	Considers that MRZ-R5 will help enable facilities and services that are suited to a residential setting.	Retain MRZ-R5 (Boarding houses) as notified.	Reject.	Yes.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.370	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R5	Support in part	MRZ-R5 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-R5 (Boarding houses) with amendment.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.371	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R5	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R5 should be amended to recognise changing urban environments and amenity in accordance with the NPS-UD, and to preclude both public and limited notification as the activity is residential in nature and anticipated within the zone.	Amend MRZ-R5.2 (Boarding houses) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity adversely impacts on the <u>planned urban built form amenity values</u> of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood.  Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R5.2.a is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.	Reject.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R5	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents.  Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R5 (Boarding houses) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.	Reject.	No.
Airbnb	126.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R6	Support	Supports the approach to visitor accommodation in the residential zone.	Retain MRZ-R6 (Visitor Accomodation) as notified.	Reject.	Yes.
Khoi Phan	326.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R6	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend MRZ-R6 (Visitor accommodation) as follows:  1. Activity status: Permitted  Where: 2. The maximum occupancy does not exceed <del>40</del> 20 guests per night.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.372	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R6	Support in part	MRZ-R6 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-R6 (Visitor accommodation) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.373	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R6	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R6 should be amended to recognise changing urban environments and amenity in accordance with the NPS-UD.	Amend MRZ-R6.2 (Visitor accommodation) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity adversely impacts on the <u>planned urban built form amenity values</u> of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood. ..	Reject.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R6	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents.  Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R6 (Visitor accommodation) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.288	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R7	Support in part	The submitter supports the permitted activity status for childcare service activities for up to 10 children, the effects of larger scale activities of this nature should be assessed through a resource consent and the RD activity status for childcare activities exceeding 10 children at a time is considered appropriate.	Retain Rule MRZ-R7 (Childcare services) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Waka Kotahi	370.289	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R7	Amend	Considers that traffic effects should be added as a matter of discretion as childcare activities can generate high volumes of traffic. Considers that in urban areas, childcare services should be located and designed to facilitate alternative transport modes – e.g located in densely populated areas with good walking connections. In addition, considers a matter of discretion should be included to support multi-use development, provision to include childcare facilities into residential developments where possible	Amend Rule MRZ-R7 (Childcare services) as follows:  1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with MRZ-R7.1.a or MRZ-R7.1.b cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity may adversely impact on the amenity values of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood; <u>and</u> 2. <u>The extent to which childcare facilities are integrated into residential development;</u> 3. <u>Expected traffic generation and effects on the road network;</u> <u>and</u> 4. How alternative modes will be supported.	Accept in part.	Yes.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.341	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R7	Support	Considers that MRZ-R7 will help enable facilities and services that are suited to a residential setting.	Retain MRZ-R7 (Childcare services) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.374	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R7	Support in part	MRZ-R7 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-R7 (Childcare services) with amendment.	Reject.	No.



## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.375	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R7	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R7 should be amended to recognise changing urban environments and amenity in accordance with the NPS-UD.	Amend MRZ-7.2 (Childcare services) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: 1. The extent to which the intensity and scale of the activity adversely impacts on the <u>planned urban built form amenity values</u> of nearby residential properties and the surrounding neighbourhood. ...	Reject.	No.
Ministry of Education	400.96	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R7	Support	Supports that the District Plan continues to outline exclusions for childcare facilities in relevant rules in residential zones.	Retain MRZ-R7 (Childcare services) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R7	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents.  Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R7 (Childcare services) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.122	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Support	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, and for applications under this rule being precluded from being publicly notified. However, considers that retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity). Permitted activity status recognises that retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	Retain MRZ-R8 (Retirement village) and seeks amendments as outlined below.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.123	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, and for applications under this rule being precluded from being publicly notified. However, considers that retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity). Permitted activity status recognises that retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	Retain MRZ-R8 (Retirement village) and seeks amendment	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.124	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Amend	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, and for applications under this rule being precluded from being publicly notified. However, considers that retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity). Permitted activity status recognises that retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	Amend MRZ-R8 (Retirement village) as follows:  Activity status: <del>Restricted Discretionary Permitted</del>  Matters of discretion are: <del>The matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3 and MRZ-P7.</del>  Notification status: <del>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R8.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.</del>	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.125	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Support in part	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, and for applications under this rule being precluded from being publicly notified. However, considers that retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity). Permitted activity status recognises that retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	Retain MRZ-R8 (Retirement village) and seeks amendment	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.126	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Amend	Supports the inclusion of a retirement village specific rule, and for applications under this rule being precluded from being publicly notified. However, considers that retirement villages as an activity should be a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity). Permitted activity status recognises that retirement villages are residential activities and provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.	Amend MRZ-R8 (Retirement village) as follows:  Activity status: <del>Restricted Discretionary Permitted</del>  Matters of discretion are: <del>The matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3 and MRZ-P7.</del>  Notification status: <del>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R8.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.</del>	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.290	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Support in part	Supports the Restricted Discretionary Activity status for retirement villages.	Retain Rule MRZ-R8 (Retirement village) with amendment.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Waka Kotahi	370.291	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Amend	Supports provided earlier submission point on MRZ-P7 is implemented.	Retain MRZ-R8 (Retirement Village) as notified, provided changes to MRZ-P7 are made as per earlier submission point.	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.342	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Support	Considers that MRZ-R8 will help enable facilities and services that are suited to a residential setting.	Retain MRZ-R8 (Retirement village) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.376	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Support	MRZ-R8 is generally supported.	Retain MRZ-R8 (Retirement village) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.27	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Oppose in part	<p>The submitter states that a retirement village use requires resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity. The matters of discretion are policies MRZ-P2 (housing supply and choice), P3 (Housing needs) and P7 (Retirement Villages). Each of these policies relates to the provision of housing and the design of the housing development (in this case a retirement village).</p> <p>The construction of a retirement village also requires resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity. The matters of discretion are broader but also include policies MRZ-P2, P3 and P7.</p> <p>This means that when a resource consent is required for a retirement village, an applicant will be required to apply for a resource consent to enable both the construction and use of a retirement village. It is unnecessary to require two consents to be obtained that require consideration of the same criteria. It is also unclear why the use should require resource consent.</p> <p>Retirement villages should be a permitted activity (while their construction remains a restricted discretionary activity). The applicant will still need to provide the same information for a new retirement village development and it will be assessed against the same criteria.</p>	Seeks to amend the activity status of retirement villages to: Permitted and Delete the matters of discretion and notification status.	Reject.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Oppose	<p>Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents.</p> <p>Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.</p>	Seeks that MRZ-R8 (Retirement village) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	F5126.17	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	F5128.17	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R8	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.292	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R9	Support in part	Rule MRZ-R9 is supported, but amendment is sought.	Retain Rule MRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.293	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R9	Amend	Considers that commercial activities should be included as a restricted discretionary activity in MRZ-R9. Considers that access to appropriately located and scaled commercial activities improves amenity for residents in urban environments and creates walkable environments. Supports this rule provided that commercial services are included and MRZ-P15 is revised to include provision for integrated residential developments.	Amend Rule MRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) as follows: Community facility, <u>commercial activity</u> health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.343	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R9	Support	Considers that MRZ-R9 will help enable facilities and services that are suited to a residential setting.	Retain MRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.377	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R9	Support	MRZ-R9 is generally supported.	Retain MRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Ministry of Education	400.97	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R9	Support in part	Supports MRZ-R9 in part.	Retain MRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) with amendment.	Accept.	Yes.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ministry of Education	400.98	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R9	Amend	Seeks MRZ-R9 be amended. The submitter seeks to replace 'education facilities' with 'educational facilities' to keep definitions consistent throughout the plan.	Amend MRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) as follows:  Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding childcare services)  1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: The matters in MRZ-P15.  Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R9.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.	Accept.	Yes.
Craig Palmer	492.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R9	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents.  Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R9 (Community facility, health care facility, emergency facility, education facility (excluding child care services)) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.	Reject.	No.
Anne Lian	132.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled or Restricted Discretionary.	Reject.	No.
Ingo Schommer	133.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled or Restricted Discretionary.	Reject.	No.
Olivier Reuland	134.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled or Restricted Discretionary.	Reject.	No.
Grant Buchan	143.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.	Reject.	No.
Braydon White	146.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.	Reject.	No.
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.	Reject.	No.
Amos Mann	172.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.	Reject.	No.
Patrick Wilkes	173.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.	Reject.	No.
Pete Gent	179.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.	Reject.	No.
Peter Nunns	196.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled or Restricted Discretionary.	Reject.	No.
Andrew Flanagan	198.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity. These activities could and do bring life and charm to all parts of the city.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled or Restricted Discretionary.	Reject.	No.
Richard W Keller	232.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Gabriela Roque-Worce	234.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled or Restricted Discretionary.	Reject.	No.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.42	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain MRZ-R10 (All other activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.294	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Support	Rule MRZ-R10 is supported.	Retain Rule MRZ-R10 (All other activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.	Reject.	No.
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.	Reject.	No.
David Cadman	398.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary.	Reject.	No.
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) of Discretionary be changed to Permitted, or Controlled, or Restricted Discretionary.	Reject.	No.
Jonathan Markwick	490.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Amend	Considers that small-scale commercial activity should not be a discretionary activity.	Seeks that the activity status for MRZ-R10 (All other activities) relating to small-scale commercial activity should be changed from Discretionary to Permitted, Controlled or Restricted Discretionary.  [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R10	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents.  Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R10 (All other activities) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.	Reject.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.177	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R11	Support	Supports the rule as the maintenance and repair of buildings and structures within the MRZ is a permitted activity.	Retain MRZ-R11 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.378	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R11	Support	MRZ-R11 is generally supported.	Retain MRZ-R11 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R11	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents.  Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R11 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.18	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R11	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.18	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R11	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.178	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R12	Support	Supports the policy as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the MRZ is a permitted activity.	Retain MRZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.250	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R12	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Retain MRZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.251	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R12	Amend	Supports the permitted activity status for the demolition of buildings provided that building waste is properly disposed of. This gives effect to Policy 34 of the operative RPS.	Amend MRZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.379	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R12	Support	MRZ-R12 is generally supported.	Retain MRZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R12	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents.  Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R12 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.19	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R12	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.19	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R12	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Monique Zorn	205.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Oppose	Considers that the removal of front yard standards reduces the ability to meet the objectives and policies in the MRZ. 11m high developments on front boundaries are more appropriate in central city, centres and inner residential areas. Construction of buildings on the front boundary of a property creates risks and hazards for footpath users, such as doors opening onto streets and garages opening directly onto paths.  Buildings on the front boundaries undermines the streets amenity.  The residential design guide leans positively towards a landscaped and active front yard, not an absence of a front yard.  The side yard standard has the effect of allowing 11m maximum height to be closer to the neighbouring property, reducing neighbours residential amenity.  The removal of the side yard standard also reduces the practical utility area in which to put rubbish bins, bikes or household goods, rear property access, maintenance of side properties without trespassing and may reduce emergency service access.  The removal of side yard standards changes the way utilities can be configured and laid.  The removal of this side yard standard of 1m across all residential zones will compromise residential amenity and good neighbourly relations.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Opposes MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) to the extent that front and side yards are not required and seeks amendment,	Accept.	Yes.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Monique Zorn	205.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	<p>Considers that the removal of front yard standards reduces the ability to meet the objectives and policies in the MRZ.</p> <p>11m high developments on front boundaries are more appropriate in central city, centres and inner residential areas.</p> <p>Construction of buildings on the front boundary of a property creates risks and hazards for footpath users, such as doors opening onto streets and garages opening directly onto paths.</p> <p>Buildings on the front boundaries undermines the streets amenity.</p> <p>The residential design guide leans positively towards a landscaped and active front yard, not an absence of a front yard.</p> <p>The side yard standard has the effect of allowing 11m maximum height to be closer to the neighbouring property, reducing neighbours residential amenity.</p> <p>The removal of the side yard standard also reduces the practical utility area in which to put rubbish bins, bikes or household goods, rear property access, maintenance of side properties without trespassing and may reduce emergency service access.</p> <p>The removal of side yard standards changes the way utilities can be configured and laid.</p> <p>The removal of this side yard standard of 1m across all residential zones will compromise residential amenity and good neighbourly relations.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Seeks that MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) is amended so that the front and side yard setbacks established in MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) apply.</p>	Accept.	Yes.
Leeanne Templer	206.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	<p>Considers that Rama Crescent does not have the infrastructure for further intensification.</p> <p>Considers that there is a need to retain existing covenants on titles in Rama Crescent which protect views.</p> <p>Considers that there needs to be provision for onsite parking in Rama Crescent because public transport can't enter and walking is tough.</p> <p>Considers that ambassadorial residences on the street require privacy and further stories and intensification would compromise this.</p>	<p>Seeks amendment to exclude Rama Crescent and the streets above it from the application of MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) so that it is not permitted in Rama cres and excluded from building height increases and intensification.</p>	Reject.	No.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	315.186	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	<p>Considers that on the basis the National Grid is a qualifying matter, MRZ-R13 should be amended to clarify activities subject to the rule are subject to the qualifying matter area provisions. Considers the note would assist with plan interpretation and application.</p>	<p>Amend Rule MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows:</p> <p>MRZ-R13 Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>...</p> <p>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R13.2.a which results from non-compliance with MRZ-S1, MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4 or MRZ-S5 is precluded from being publicly notified.</p> <p>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R13.2.a which results from non-compliance with MRZ-S6, MRZ-S7, MRZ-S8, MRZ-S9 or MRZ-S10 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</p> <p><u>Note: Activities subject to MRZ-R13 shall comply with, and are subject to, the relevant provisions for qualifying matter areas.</u></p>	Reject.	No.
Khoi Phan	326.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	<p>Considers that apartment buildings should permit up to 15 units per site without resource consent.</p>	<p>Amend the title of MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows:</p> <p>Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than <u>three fifteen</u> residential units occupy the site</p>	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Bruce Rae	334.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	<p>Considers that MRZ-R13 should be amended to include two omitted relevant matters in qualifying matters.</p> <p>The first matter is that there is no indication of a minimum site size to which this rule applies, or how cross leases are to be treated - Many once ample sites have been subdivided, some into areas 300 m2 or even less. The addresses 85, 85A, 87, 87A &amp; 89 marine parade in Seatoun (ignoring other overlays) are considered as an example. 85 &amp; 85A have been subdivided, 85 is 812m2, with a smaller front site of 392m2 at 85A 87 &amp; 87A are 2 houses on one cross leased site with an area of 926m2 89 appears to have had an area for an additional house subdivided from the rear of the site, but retains an area of 2852m2.</p> <p>The second matter is that no account is taken of the effects of topography, the most severe of these is shading and overlooking from sites on a south-facing slope.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:  <u>a. The site is of a minimum area of 400m2 and</u>  <u>b. The site does not have a south-facing slope of steeper than 15° and</u>  <u>c. Compliance with the following standards is achieved:</u>                      ...</p>	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.295	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Support in part	<p>Support permitted activity status of MRZ-R13 to construct up to three dwellings that comply with standards, provided that further weighting assessment is done on restrictions on character precincts, mount Victoria north townscape precinct and oriental bay height precinct as well, and provided that changes are made to standards as per our submission points.</p>	<p>Retain MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.</p>	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.296	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	<p>Support permitted activity status of MRZ-R13 to construct up to three dwellings that comply with standards, provided that further weighting assessment is done on restrictions on character precincts, mount Victoria north townscape precinct and oriental bay height precinct as well, and provided that changes are made to standards as per our submission points.</p>	<p>Retain MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.</p>	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.344	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	<p>Considers that it should be evident that the Residential Design Guide applies to all residential buildings.</p>	<p>Amend the matters of Discretion under MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) to add a new matter of discretion:                       "The Residential Design Guide"</p>	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.380	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Support in part	<p>MRZ-R13 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.</p>	<p>Retain MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) with amendment.</p>	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.381	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	<p>Considers that MRZ-R13 should be amended to allow the rule to apply to all buildings not just those associated with no more than three residential units on a site. A further amendment is sought to delete reference to MRZ-P10 which is opposed.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows:</p> <p>Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site</p> <p>1. Activity Status: Permitted                      where:  <u>a. There are no more than three residential units on a site; and</u>  <u>b. Compliance with the following standards is achieved:</u>                      ...</p> <p>2. Activity status Restricted Discretionary                      where:                      a. Compliance with any of the requirements of MRZ-R13.1.a and MRZ-R13.1.b <del>cannot be</del> <u>are not</u> achieved.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:                      2. The matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P4, MRZ-P5, MRZ-P8, MRZ-P9, <del>MRZ-P10</del> and MRZ-P11; <u>and</u>                      3. where compliance with MRZ-R13.1.a is not achieved, the matters in MRZ-P6.</p>	Reject.	No.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.117	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	<p>Considers that for health and safety reasons, a setback for structures from the rail corridor boundary is sought. KiwiRail seek that the railway corridor be identified as a qualifying matter and be applied to require a building setback for structures from the rail corridor boundary.</p> <p>KiwiRail seek amendment to this rule to ensure compliance with the requested rail corridor boundary setback standard (MRZ-S4) is required.</p>	<p>Amend HRZ-R13.1 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows:</p> <p>1. Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:                      a. Compliance with the following standards is achieved:                      i. MRZ-S1;                      ii. MRZ-S3;                      iii. MRZ-S4 only in relation to the rear yard <u>and rail corridor</u> boundary setbacks;                      iv. ...                      ...</p>	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.118	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	Considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with. This amendment is sought in addition to the amendment sought in relation to MRZ-R13.1.	Amend MRZ-R13.2 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) as follows:  2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary  Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirement of MRZ-R13.1.a cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. ... 2. ... 3. <u>The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u>	Accept in part.	Yes.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.32	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Rachel Underwood	458.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Amend	Considers inappropriate to include the standards for setbacks and side yards when implementing MRZ-R13.	Seeks to amend MRZ-R13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) as follows: Compliance with the following standards is achieved: MRZ-S1; MRZ-S3; MRZ-S4 only in relation to the rear yard boundary setback; MRZ-S5...  [inferred decision requested].	Accept.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R13	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents.  Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R13 (Construction, addition or alteration of buildings and structures where no more than three residential units occupy the site) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.	Reject.	No.
Stratum Management Limited	249.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Amend	The non-notification statement for this rule precludes public notification. Given that any multi-unit development is subject to this rule, and that it specifies a range of standards that apply to multi-unit development, where a proposal meets these standards, it should be processed on a non-notified basis.	Amend the notification status under MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) by adding the following:  <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14.1 that meets the standards specified is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u>	Accept in part.	Yes.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.209	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought by The RVA in relation to MRZ-R14 and HRZ-R14.	Accept in part.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.209	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought by Ryman in relation to MRZ-R14 and HRZ-R14.	Accept in part.	No.
Wellington City Council	266.133	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Amend	Considers the notification clauses for 4 or more household units need to align with Sch 3A, cl 5 of the RMA. This also needs to reflect the building standards	Amend the notification clause of MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows:  <del>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being publicly notified.</del>  <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14.1 which results from non-compliance with MRZ-S2, MRZ-S3, MRZ-S4 or MRZ-S5, is precluded from being publicly notified.</u>  <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14.1 which results from non-compliance with MRZ-S12, MRZ-S13 or MRZ-S14, is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u>	Accept in part.	Yes.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.107	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZR14	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the amendments as other standards should also be precluded from notification. Standards 7 to 11 largely relate to impacts internal to sites, such as outlook space and permeable surfaces, so should also be considered for notification preclusion.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.241	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission in so far as it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought in The RVA's primary submission.	Accept in part.	No.



Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.241	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission in so far as it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought in Ryman's primary submission.	Accept in part.	No.
Khoi Phan	326.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Amend	Considers that apartment buildings should be allowed to be maintained and fixed without the need of resource consents.	Amend MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows:  1. Activity status: <del>Restricted Discretionary Permitted</del> ...	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.127	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Oppose in part	Supports the construction of buildings or structures for a retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under MRZ-R14. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 1 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the height, height in relation to boundary, setbacks and building coverage standards. However, considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 2, are not appropriate except for the reference to MRZ-P7 (subject to the submission points on that policy). The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management.  Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects provided by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites.  Supports MRZ-R14 being precluded from being publicly notified, but in accordance with Schedule 3A (5)(2) of the Act Considers that a retirement village that is compliant with MRZ S2 – MRZ-S5 should also be precluded from limited notification.	Retain MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and seeks amendment	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.128	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Amend	Supports the construction of buildings or structures for a retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under MRZ-R14. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 1 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the height, height in relation to boundary, setbacks and building coverage standards. However, considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 2, are not appropriate except for the reference to MRZ-P7 (subject to the submission points on that policy). The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management.  Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects provided by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites.  Supports MRZ-R14 being precluded from being publicly notified, but in accordance with Schedule 3A (5)(2) of the Act Considers that a retirement village that is compliant with MRZ S2 – MRZ-S5 should also be precluded from limited notification.	Amend MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows:	Accept in part.	Yes.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.129	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Support in part	Supports the construction of buildings or structures for a retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity under MRZ-R14. Does not oppose the inclusion of the matters of discretion in Clause 1 relating to the extent and effect on non-compliance with the height, height in relation to boundary, setbacks and building coverage standards. However, considers that the matters of discretion in Clause 2, are not appropriate except for the reference to MRZ-P7 (subject to the submission points on that policy). The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management.  Considers that a set of retirement village specific matters of discretion should be included that are based on the MDRS provisions; consider / acknowledge the positive effects provided by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites.  Supports MRZ-R14 being precluded from being publicly notified, but in accordance with Schedule 3A (5)(2) of the Act Considers that a retirement village that is compliant with MRZ S2 – MRZ-S5 should also be precluded from limited notification.	Amend MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows:	Accept in part.	Yes.
Waka Kotahi	370.297	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Support in part	Support restricted discretionary activity status for multi-unit housing or a retirement village – if changes are made to standards as per our submission points.	Retain MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and make changes to standards as per earlier submissions.	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.298	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Amend	Support restricted discretionary activity status for multi-unit housing or a retirement village – if changes are made to standards as per our submission points.	Retain MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) and make changes to standards as per earlier submissions.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.382	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Support in part	MRZ-R14 is partially supported, particularly the preclusion of public notification. Amendments are sought to preclude limited notification for developments that comply with the relevant standards.	Retain MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) with amendment.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.383	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R14 should be amended to preclude limited notification for developments that comply with the relevant standards. The inclusion of multi-unit housing is opposed, as this can be managed through MRZ-R13 in accordance with the amendments sought to that rule.	Amend MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) as follows:  MRZ-R14 Construction of buildings for <del>multi-unit housing</del> or a retirement village  1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary  Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any of the follow standards as specified in the associated assessment criteria for any infringed standard: i. MRZ-S2; ii. MRZ-S3; iii. MRZ-S4; iv. MRZ-S5; v. MRZ-S12 for multi-unit housing only; vi. <del>MRZ-S13 for multi-unit housing only;</del> vii. <del>MRZ-S14 for multi-unit housing only;</del>  2. The matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P5, <del>MRZ-P6</del> , MRZ-P7, MRZ-P8, <del>MRZ-P10</del> and MRZ-P11  Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14 is precluded from being publicly notified.  <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14 that complies with the relevant standards is precluded from public and limited notification.</u>	Accept in part.	Yes.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.135	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission where this aligns with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.135	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission where this aligns with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Metlifecare Limited	413.28	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Support in part	Supports the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity because it recognises that retirement village development is compatible with residential environments.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Metlifecare Limited	413.29	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Amend	Supports the construction of retirement villages as a restricted discretionary activity because it recognises that retirement village development is compatible with residential environments.	Amend MRZ-R14 as follows: Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. The extent and effect of non-compliance with any of the following standards as specified in the associated assessment criteria for any infringed standard: i. MRZ-S2; ii. MRZ-S3; iii. MRZ-S4; iv. MRZ-S5; ... 2. The matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P5, MRZ-P6 (for multi-unit housing only), MRZ-P7 (for retirement villages only), MRZ-P8 (for multi-unit housing only), MRZ-P10, and MRZ-P11, MRZ-P[X], and MRZ-P[Y] (for retirement villages only).	Accept in part.	Yes.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.37	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Amend	Considers that since this rule makes all multi-unit housing a RD activity and refers back to broad policies as matters of discretion, Council's scope is too broad for an RD activity. Considers this may risk failing to meet S77B, and Council is already required to consider relevant policies under 104(1)(b).	Amend MRZ-R14 to:  2. The matters in MRZ-P2, MRZ-P3, MRZ-P5, MRZ-P6, MRZ-P7, MRZ-P8, MRZ-P10 and MRZ-P11.	Reject.	No.
Survey & Spatial New Zealand Wellington Branch	439.38	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Amend	Considers that preclusion from public notification only does not comply with Clause 5(2) of Schedule 3A, which requires both limited and public notification be excluded for any resource consent for 4-units that comply with the MDRS.	Amend MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) to:  Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being publicly notified. <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being limited notified where the proposal complies with MRZ-S2 to MRZ-S9.</u> <u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule MRZ-R14.1 is precluded from being limited notified where the proposal complies with MRZ-S2 to MRZ-S5 and MRZ-S12 to MRZ-S14.</u>	Accept in part.	Yes.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.211	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought by The RVA in relation to MRZ-R14 and HRZ-R14.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.211	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission to the extent it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points, subject to the relief sought by Ryman in relation to MRZ-R14 and HRZ-R14.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Craig Palmer	492.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents.  Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R14 (Construction of buildings or structures for multi-unit housing or a retirement village) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.20	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.20	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R14	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R15	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents.  Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R15 (Fences and standalone walls) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.21	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R15	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.21	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R15	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Wellington City Council	266.134	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R16	Amend	Considers this rule change provides for small structures on legal road (up to 1.5m high) as a Permitted Activity. This will reduce consenting requirements. It is noted that structures on legal road are covered by the encroachment licence process. Considers there is a consequential amendment to update the Restricted Discretionary rule.	Amend MRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures over legal road) as follows:  <u>1. Activity status: Permitted</u>  <u>Where:</u>  <u>a. It is a retaining wall of less than 1.5m in height above ground level.</u>  <del>2. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary</del>  <u>Where:</u>  <u>1. Compliance with any of the requirements of MRZ-R16.1.a cannot be achieved.</u>  (...)	Accept in part.	Yes.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.179	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R16	Support in part	Supports the rule as the development on or over a legal road is a restricted discretionary activity and development must ensure that highway access and safety is maintained for all road users. Fire and Emergency relies on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network to respond to emergency call outs. It is therefore critical that buildings and structures on legal roads do not hinder the ability for FENZ to respond to emergency call outs effectively and efficiently for firefighting and other rescue operations. A further matter of discretion is therefore sought	Supports MRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road), with amendment.	Accept.	Yes.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.180	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R16	Amend	Supports the rule as the development on or over a legal road is a restricted discretionary activity and development must ensure that highway access and safety is maintained for all road users. Fire and Emergency relies on the safe and efficient operation of the transport network to respond to emergency call outs. It is therefore critical that buildings and structures on legal roads do not hinder the ability for FENZ to respond to emergency call outs effectively and efficiently for firefighting and other rescue operations. A further matter of discretion is therefore sought	Amend MRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as follows:  ...  Matters of discretion are restricted to:  ...  3. Maintaining safe access and safety for road users, including pedestrians; and 4. The matters in MRZ-P8, MRZ-P10 and MRZ-P11; and 5. <u>Maintaining the ability for emergency services, including fire appliances, to access the property for firefighting purposes.</u>	Accept.	Yes.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.38	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R16	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.38	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R16	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as matters relating to fire-fighting servicing are already provided for under the Building Act and it is inappropriate to duplicate controls under the Proposed Plan.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.299	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R16	Support in part	Rule MRZ-R16 is supported, but amendment is sought.	Retain Rule MRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part.	Yes
Waka Kotahi	370.300	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R16	Amend	Considers that amendments to Rule MRZ-R16 are required to ensure visibility over the road corridor.	Amend MRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as follows:  1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where the legal road is controlled by Waka Kotahi, written approval has been provided from Waka Kotahi authorising the building or structure.  Matters of discretion are:  ...	Accept in part.	Yes.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.384	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R16	Support	MRZ-R16 is supported.	Retain MRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R16	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents.  Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R16 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	F5126.22	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R16	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	F5128.22	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R16	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.181	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R17	Support	Supports the policy as the addition or alteration to buildings and structures within the MRZ is provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity. FENZ has existing stations in the Medium Density Residential Zone which may require future extension or alteration.	Retain MRZ-R17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.130	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R17	Support in part	Supports additions and alterations to retirement villages being provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under MRZ-R17. Considers the matters of discretion need to align with those for new retirement villages. Supports MRZ-R17.2a being precluded from being publicly notified, but in accordance with Schedule 3A(5)(s) of the Act Considers that alterations and additions to retirement villages that are compliant with MRZ-S2 – MRZ-S5 should also be precluded from limited notification.	Retain MRZ-R17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) and seeks amendments.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	350.131	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R17	Amend	Supports additions and alterations to retirement villages being provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under MRZ-R17. Considers the matters of discretion need to align	Amend MRZ-R17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) as follows:	Accept in part.	Yes.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.345	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R17	Amend	Considers that it should be evident that the Residential Design Guide applies to all residential buildings.	Amend the matters of Discretion under MRZ-R17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) to add a new matter of discretion:  "The Residential Design Guide"	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	F5126.220	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R17	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	F5128.220	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R17	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.385	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R17	Support in part	MRZ-R17 is generally supported, particularly the preclusion of public notification. Amendments are sought.	Retain MRZ-R17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) with amendment.	Accept in part.	Yes.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.386	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R17	Amend	Considers that MRZ-R17 should be amended to remove reference to policies which are opposed and reference to multi-unit housing. There is also a reference to HRZ-P8 which is incorrect.	Amend MRZ-17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) as follows:  1. Activity status: Permitted Where: Compliance with the following standards is achieved: i. MRZ-S2; ii. MRZ-S3; iii. MRZ-S4; iv. MRZ-S5; v. MRZ-S6; and vi. MRZ-S12.; vii. <del>MRZ-S13;</del> and viii. <del>MRZ-S14.</del>  2. Activity Status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance is not achieved with any of the requirements of MRZ-R17.1.a <del>cannot be achieved.</del>  Matters of Discretion are: 1. The extent and effect on non-compliance with any relevant standard as specified in the associated assessment criteria for the infringed standard; 2. The matters in MRZ-P9, <del>MRZ-P10</del> ; MRZ-P11 and MRZ-P15; and The matters in MRZ-P6, MRZ-P7 and <del>MRZ-P8</del> for additions and alterations to <del>multi-unit housing or</del> a retirement village.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Metlifecare Limited	413.30	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R17	Support in part	Supports additions and alterations being a permitted activity to allow minor alterations such as ramps for accessibility and new covered decks without a resource consent.	Retain MRZ-R17 as notified, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.	Reject.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.31	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R17	Amend	Reason not specified [please refer to original submission].	Retain MRZ-R17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) as notified, while recognising that not all of the standards will be applicable, as follows:  a. Compliance with the following standards is achieved <u>(as applicable)</u> :	Reject.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.22	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-R17	Oppose	Opposes the preclusion of limited notification in the rule and accordingly notification of neighbouring property owners and residents.  Considers that without local knowledge, discretionary powers cannot be exercised with all the implications weighed in the balance.	Seeks that MRZ-R17 (Construction of any other building or structure, including additions and alterations) be amended to be able to be limited notified to request identification of faults and improvements to address local conditions.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.23	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Oppose	The RVA opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with the RVA's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.23	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Oppose	Ryman opposes the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and will slow down, not speed up, the provision of housing for the ageing population which is inconsistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act and the NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.399	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R1	Oppose	MRZ-PREC03-R1 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-R1 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.85	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ PREC03-R1	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow	Accept.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.74	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R1	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-R1 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form.  The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-R1 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.400	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R2	Oppose	MRZ-PREC03-R2 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-R2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.22	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R2	Oppose	Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities wishes to remove reference of Demolition throughout the PDP.  TRA are mindful that the greenest buildings are those timber buildings that are already built. There's an accumulative benefit from not demolishing older native timber buildings which have low carbon emissions instead of constructing new buildings using materials (such as concrete and steel) with significant whole of life carbon emissions.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.86	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R2	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.75	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R2	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-R2 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form.  The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-R2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.401	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R3	Oppose	MRZ-PREC03-R3 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-R3 (Additions or alterations to existing buildings, structures or accessory buildings) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.87	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R3	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.76	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R3	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-R3 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form.  The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-R3 (Additions or alterations to existing buildings, structures or accessory buildings) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.307	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R4	Not specified	[Submitter has provided a neutral position on this provision]  Considers that further weighting exercise is required in order to justify the inclusion, nature and extent of provisions related to special character.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-R4 (Fences and standalone walls) subject to further evaluation and weighting exercise to determine extent of protection required on balance with achieving the outcomes of the NPS-UD.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.402	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R4	Oppose	MRZ-PREC03-R4 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-R4 (Construction, alteration or addition to buildings, structures or accessory buildings that are not Permitted Activities) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.77	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R4	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-R4 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form.  The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-R4 (Construction, alteration or addition to buildings, structures or accessory buildings that are not Permitted Activities) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Investore Property Limited	405.50	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R4	Support in part	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-R4.1 (Construction, addition or alteration of any buildings, structures or accessory buildings that are not Permitted Activities) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.81	Part 3 / Residential Zones / MediumDensityResidentialZone / MRZ-PREC03-R4	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.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.81	Part 3 / Residential Zones / MediumDensityResidentialZone / MRZ-PREC03-R4	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.	No.
Investore Property Limited	405.51	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R4	Amend	Considers that design guides are reference documents that sit best outside the district plan, rather than being formally incorporated into the district plan.	Amend MRZ-PREC03-R4.1 (Construction, addition or alteration of any buildings, structures or accessory buildings that are not Permitted Activities) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.82	Part 3 / Residential Zones / MediumDensityResidentialZone / MRZ-PREC03-R4	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.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.82	Part 3 / Residential Zones / MediumDensityResidentialZone / MRZ-PREC03-R4	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.	No.
Wellington City Council	266.135	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R5	Amend	Considers there is an error in the rule which is old drafting.	Amend MRZ-PREC-03-R5.1 (Fences and standalone walls) as follows:  (...)  Where: 1. Compliance with <u>MRZ-PREC-03-S6</u> <u>MRZ-OBPH-S6</u> is achieved.	Accept.	Yes.
Wellington City Council	266.136	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R5	Amend	Considers there is an error in the rule which is old drafting.	Amend MRZ-PREC-03-R5.2 (Fences and standalone walls) as follows:  (...)  Where: 1. Compliance with <u>MRZ-PREC-03-S6</u> <u>MRZ-OBPH-S6</u> is achieved.	Accept.	Yes.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.403	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R5	Oppose	MRZ-PREC03-R5 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-R5 (Fences and standalone walls) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.89	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R5	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.78	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R5	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-R5 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form.  The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-R5 (Fences and standalone walls) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.308	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R6	Not specified	Neutral and considers that amendments to Rule MRZ-PREC03-R6 are required to ensure visibility over the road corridor.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-R6 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) with amendments.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Waka Kotahi	370.309	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R6	Amend	Neutral but considers that amendments to Rule MRZ-PREC03-R6 are required to ensure visibility over the road corridor.	Amend Rule MRZ-PREC03-R6 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary <u>Where the legal road is controlled by Waka Kotahi, written approval has been provided from Waka Kotahi authorising the building or structure.</u> Matters of discretion are:	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.404	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R6	Oppose	MRZ-PREC03-R6 is opposed, consistent with the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-R6 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.90	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R6	Oppose	Considers that character precincts in PDP protect significant amenity values in Wellington City and ought to be retained.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.79	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-R6	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-R6 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form.  The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-R6 (Buildings and structures on or over a legal road) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
David Stevens	151.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes the surrounding area of Khandallah being medium density four storey with a height limit of 14m.  Considers that there is not overwhelming demand for housing or business given the limited public transport options available.  Considers that the MRZ three storey requirements imposed under the NPS-UD and development along the proposed RTS corridors (excluding JVL) provides ample scope for residential development to meet the expected population growth for the city.	Seeks that the surrounding area of Khandallah should be zoned Medium Density Residential Zone, with a storey /11m maximum height limit throughout.  [Inferred decision requested].	Reject.	No.
David Stevens	151.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the MRZ three storey requirements imposed under the NPS-UD and development along the proposed RTS corridors (excluding JVL) provides ample scope for residential development to meet the expected population growth for the city.	Seeks that the corridor from Broadmeadows to Crofton Downs should be MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) 3-storey 11m throughout, including the Khandallah and Ngaio Centres.	Reject.	No.
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Amend MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards	Amend MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standard recommendations.	Reject.	No.
Leeanne Templer	206.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Opposes the height limit of 11m in MRZ-S1 in Rama Crescent and the streets above it.  Considers that Rama Crescent does not have the infrastructure for further intensification.  Considers that there is a need to retain existing covenants on titles in Rama Crescent which protect views.  Considers that there needs to be provision for onsite parking in Rama Crescent because public transport can't enter and walking is tough.  Considers that ambassadorial residencies on the street require privacy and further stories and intensification would compromise this.	Seeks an amendment to MRZ-S1 (Building Height Controls) so that that Rama Crescent and streets above Rama Crescent are exempt from the 11m Height Limit.	Reject.	No.
Richard W Keller	232.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Amend MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards	Amend MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1 where no more than three residential units occupy the site) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards	Reject.	No.
Wellington City Council	266.137	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Considers there is a need to amend exemptions to MRZ-S1 (Height control area 1)	Amend MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1) exemptions as follows: (...)  This standard does not apply to: a. Fences or standalone walls- b. Solar panel and heating components attached to a building provided these do not exceed the height by more than 500mm; and c. Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m measured vertically.	Accept.	Yes.



Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Everard Aspell	270.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Not specified	Considers that allowing building heights of 11-21 metres in the inner city suburbs of Mount Victoria, Mount Cook, Thorndon, Berhampore, Newtown and Aro Valley will create shading, privacy issues, loss of green areas, reduced property values; will forever change the streetscape and will not reflect the character of the area.	Seeks that intensification is restricted to brownfield sites.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.109	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Support	Part of WCC's summary: ... intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage. ... the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook. There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.182	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Support in part	Supports the standard to the extent that it provides a maximum height of 11m for any building. Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally. This is considered acceptable for fire stations in this zone. FENZ however seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations	Supports MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1), with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.183	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Supports the standard to the extent that it provides a maximum height of 11m for any building. Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in district plans generally. This is considered acceptable for fire stations in this zone. FENZ however seeks an exemption for hose drying towers associated with emergency service facilities in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of FENZ. Whilst referred to as 'hose drying towers', they serve several purposes being for hose drying, communications and training purposes on station. Hose drying towers being required at stations is dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. These structures can be around 12 to 15 metres in height. FENZ considers that the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations	Amend MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1) as follows:  <u>Clause 1 does not apply to hose drying towers up to 15m in height.</u>	Reject.	No.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.22	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the Western Side of Kelburn Parade, especially #64 Kelburn Parade should have maximum building height increased because:  - It is close to the transport network, employment opportunities and social infrastructure. - Larger building heights would support additional housing for the benefit of those utilising the university.  [See original submission for full details]	Seeks that Standard MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1) is amended so that the western side of Kelburn Parade has a maximum height limit of 21m as a permitted activity.	Reject.	No.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.23	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Oppose	Considers this dual-standard approach is unnecessary, and that the more permissive height standard in the MRZ should be enabled irrespective of scale of the development.	Seeks that standards MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1) and MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2) building height control are combined so that there are not different height standards for 1-3 residential units and multi unit developments.	Reject.	No.
Johanna Carter	296.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1...) is amended to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.	Reject.	No.
Khoi Phan	326.24	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S1 should be amended so that structures do not exceed 16 metres in height and the 15 degree slope are removed.	Amend MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1) as follows:  1. Buildings and structures must not exceed 11 16 metres in height above ground level, except that 50% of a building's roof in elevation, measured vertically from the junction between wall and roof, may exceed this height by 1 metre, <del>where the entire roof slopes 15° or more</del> , as shown in Diagram 5 below:  ...	Reject.	No.
Richard Bengé	327.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the MRZ height control area 2 (14m) at 33 Hiropi Street is too restrictive, and that Height control area 3 from the DDP would have been more appropriate. (Option C) [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Amend the Medium Density Residential Zone chapter to reinstate Height control area 3 (21m). [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Waka Kotahi	370.310	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Support	Standard MRZ-S1 is supported as it is consistent with the MDRS.	Retain Standard MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1: 1. where no..) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.405	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Support in part	MRZ-S1 is generally supported and it is acknowledged that the standard is taken from the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. However, amendments are sought to allow this standard to apply to all residential units regardless of how many are on a site and to be more enabling for residential units located within close proximity to train stations and local centres.	Retain MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1: 1. where no more than three residential units occupy the site; or 2. For the construction, addition or alteration of any buildings or structures in a Character Precinct or Mount Victoria North Townscape Precinct.) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.406	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S1 should be amended to allow this standard to apply to all residential units regardless of how many are on a site and to be more enabling for residential units located within close proximity to train stations and local centres. Consistent with the rest of the submission, the deletion of Character Precincts and associated provisions from zone chapters and as a qualifying matter is sought.	Amend MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1: - where no more than three residential units occupy the site; or - For the construction, addition or alteration of any buildings or structures in a Character Precinct or Mount Victoria North Townscape Precinct.) as follows:  Building height control 1: <del>1. where no more than three residential units occupy the site; or</del> <del>2. For the construction, addition or alteration of any buildings or structures in a Character Precinct or Mount Victoria North Townscape Precinct.</del> 1. ...  <u>Except where:</u>  2. In areas identified as having a height control of 18m in the planning maps, the height must not exceed 18 metres above ground level except that 50% of a building's roof in elevation, measured vertically from the junction between wall and roof, may exceed the heights above by 1 metre, where the entire roof slopes 15° or more, as shown in Diagram 1 below: ... ...	Reject.	No.
Donna Yule	421.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes the blanket policy of Medium Density 3 Storey Residential housing in all residential areas - the height limits are too high.  Considers that no consideration has been given to the geographical location of each individual suburb, its terrain and orientation to the sun. For suburbs that are built in a north south direction with hills either side and the main housing is on the flat, any 3 storey building will cast a significant shadow over many properties.  Many more 3 storey development means a whole suburb except for those on the hills will be in permanent shadows.  Added to that no space between properties, no outside areas to enjoy a little privacy. These suburbs will become sunless undesirable transitional suburbs where people will only stay a short time until the can afford to move elsewhere with sun & outdoor space.	Not specified.	Reject.	No.
Catharine Underwood	481.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Oppose in part	Considers that the current height control areas in Brooklyn should be removed until a proper character/heritage assessment has been completed. There are a few protected buildings in Brooklyn, but no character precinct compared to other suburbs. Brooklyn has some older well built houses and street scapes that are worth the protection.	Seeks that MRZ-S1 (Maximum height) of 11m be removed in Brooklyn, until a character/heritage assessment has been completed.	Reject.	No.
Catharine Underwood	481.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the current height control areas in Brooklyn should be removed until a proper character/heritage assessment has been completed. There are a few protected buildings in Brooklyn, but no character precinct compared to other suburbs. Brooklyn has some older well built houses and street scapes that are worth the protection.	Seeks that the Operative District Plan height controls be reinstated in Brooklyn.  [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Jonathan Markwick	490.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S1	Support	Supports the increase in building height controls around the Johnsonville centre, including those east of the motorway.	Retain MRZ-S1 (Maximum height) around Johnsonville Centre as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Lilias Bell	50.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support	Supports Proposed District Plan heights for Colway Street in Ngaio.	Retain MRZ-S2 as notified.	Accept in part.	No.



Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kim McGuiness, Andrew Cameron, Simon Bachler, Deb Hendry, Penny Evans, Stephen Evens, David Wilcox, Mary Vaughan Roberts, Siva Naguleswaran, Mohammed Talim, Ben Sutherland, Atul Patel, Lewis Roney Yip, Sarah Collier Jaggard	204.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	<p>Considers the impact of 14m height limit on neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Considers that 14m height limit is inappropriate for the character of the area.</p> <p>Considers the loss of solar access leading to damp homes and less energy efficient, loss of Biodiversity to the Newtown area, loss of wellbeing, and loss of Privacy to our family homes.</p>	Opposes Standard MRZ-S2.1.b (Maximum building height) of 14 between Adelaide Road, Stoke Street and Kenwyn Terrace and seeks amendment.	Accept.	Yes.
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support	Not specified.	Allow	Accept	Yes.
Kim McGuiness, Andrew Cameron, Simon Bachler, Deb Hendry, Penny Evans, Stephen Evens, David Wilcox, Mary Vaughan Roberts, Siva Naguleswaran, Mohammed Talim, Ben Sutherland, Atul Patel, Lewis Roney Yip, Sarah Collier Jaggard	204.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	<p>Considers the impact of 14m height limit on neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Considers that 14m height limit is inappropriate for the character of the area.</p> <p>Considers the loss of solar access leading to damp homes and less energy efficient, loss of Biodiversity to the Newtown area, loss of wellbeing, and loss of Privacy to our family homes.</p>	Amend the height control in the area between Adelaide Road, Stoke Street and Kenwyn Terrace from 14m to 11m.	Accept	Yes
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support	Not specified.	Allow	Accept	Yes.
Leeanne Templer	206.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	<p>Opposes Height Areas in MRZ-S2 for Rama Crescent and the streets above it.</p> <p>Considers that Rama Crescent does not have the infrastructure for further intensification.</p> <p>Considers that there is a need to retain existing covenants on titles in Rama Crescent which protect views.</p> <p>Considers that there needs to be provision for onsite parking in Rama Crescent because public transport can't enter and walking is tough.</p> <p>Considers that ambassadorial residencies on the street require privacy and further stories and intensification would compromise this.</p>	Seeks an amendment to MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control 2) so that that Rama Crescent and streets above Rama Crescent are excluded from building height increased and intensification.	Reject.	No.
Ruapapa Limited	225.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support	<p>Considers that there are many reasons such as steep side streets and lack of access for emergency vehicles which render more intense and higher levels of development inappropriate.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for further reason]</p>	Retain MRZ-S2.1.b (Height Area 2 - 11m) for streets branching off of Oriental Parade as notified.	Reject	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	<p>Opposes Height Control Area 2 - MRZ-S2 (14m) in the residential area of Khandallah.</p> <p>Considers that similar suburbs mainly have 11m height controls.</p> <p>11m Height Control is more appropriate for housing demand and level of commercial activity.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2: For multi-unit housing or a retirement village: or Other buildings and structures) - Height control area 2 - 14m in Khandallah.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.250	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission and the Enabling Housing Act/NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.250	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and the Enabling Housing Act/NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	Considers that the maximum height in the residential area of Khandallah should be 11m	Seeks that MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2: For multi-unit housing or a retirement village: or Other buildings and structures) - Height control area 2 - is reduced to 11 metres in Khandallah.	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.251	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission and the Enabling Housing Act/NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.251	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission and the Enabling Housing Act/NPSUD.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	237.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support	Supports a height limit of 11m for Hay Street.  Considers that Hay Street has many qualifying matters which would exempt it from intensification.  There are limited benefits that don't outweigh the consequences of intensification in Oriental Bay.  Considers that there would be significant costs related to preparing the area for intensification.  The Hay Street Heritage Report 2021 identifies a high concentration of higher quality character streetscape of Hay St.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2) - with Hay Street, including the Hay Street extension, within Height Area 2 (11m), as notified.	Reject.	No.
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.87	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	The submitter oppose points 237.2, 237.3, & 237.5 to restrict development due to 'qualifying matters' and retain Hay Street as MRZ. Qualifying Matters are set out in s77i of the RMA Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act 2021. Hay Street itself does not have any qualifying matters. Site specific limitations are addressed in a s88 RMA report Assessment of Environmental Effects. While Oriental Bay's special character has been addressed in the special Precinct Height Control's (PREC-03) overlay, it is not a Qualifying Matter.  [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Richard Martin	244.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support	Supports the 11m Height Area within the MRZ in Hay Street and Baring Street.  A 21m height limit would not work due to steep contours, history of slips, inadequate drainage, and inadequate infrastructure.  Considers that Hay Street has unique characteristics that made 21m height limit a poor idea.  Considers that Baring Street is prone to slips, has no identifiable owner, limited room for access.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain MRZ-S2 (Maximum height) as notified, with Hay Street and Baring Street within Height control area 2 (11m).	Reject	No.
Paul Ridley-Smith	245.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support	Supports a height limit of 11m for Hay Street.  Considers that Hay Street has many qualifying matters which would exempt it from intensification.  Considers that there are significant structural issues with the area, limited vehicle space water/drainage issues and heritage value in Hay Street.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain MRZ-S2 (Maximum height) as notified, with Hay Street and Baring Street within Height control area 2 (11m).	Reject	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.89	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	The submitter opposes restricting development due to 'qualifying matters' and retain Hay Street as MRZ. Qualifying Matters are set out in s77(1) of the RMA Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters Amendment Act 2021. Hay Street itself does not have any qualifying matters. Site specific limitations are addressed in a s88 RMA report Assessment of Environmental Effects. While Oriental Bay's special character has been addressed in the special Precinct Height Control's (PREC-03) overlay, it is not a Qualifying Matter.  [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Everard Aspell	270.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Not specified	Considers that allowing building heights of 11-21 metres in the inner city suburbs of Mount Victoria, Mount Cook, Thorndon, Berhampore, Newtown and Aro Valley will create shading, privacy issues, loss of green areas, reduced property values; will forever change the streetscape and will not reflect the character of the area.	Seeks that intensification is restricted to brownfield sites.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.110	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support	Part of WCC's summary: ... intensification shouldn't come at the expense of character and heritage. ... the attraction in the Lambton Ward is the unique character and heritage, older Victorian styled houses and working men's cottages dotted around Thorndon, Mount Vic, Aro Valley and Mount Cook. There are multiple brownfield sites well suited for accommodating extra population that will avoid impacting heritage and character.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.184	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support in part	Seeks the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers to enable the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations	Supports MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2), with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.185	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	As noted in the previous submission point, seeks the inclusion of an exemption for hose drying towers to enable the efficient functioning of FENZ in establishing and operating fire stations	Amend MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2) as follows:  Clause 1 does not apply to hose drying towers up to 15m in height.	Reject.	No.
Onslow Residents Community Association	283.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose in part	Considers that Khandallah is a small neighbourhood village that only supports its local community. The adjacent centres of Ngaio-Crofton Downs and Johnsonville have all the services Khandallah has, and also contain larger facilities, so do not require such support. The current supermarket and retail shops, plus services including medical, education, recreation, etc. are all small and are at capacity right now. The road the retail centre is on is a constrained one-lane road.  They therefore will not support the increased demand coming from the significant medium density development proposed by 14m zones.	Opposes MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2: For multi-unit housing or a retirement village: or Other buildings and structures) with respect to Khandallah being in Height Control Area 2 (14m).	Reject.	No.
Onslow Residents Community Association	283.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	Considers that Khandallah is a small neighbourhood village that only supports its local community. The adjacent centres of Ngaio-Crofton Downs and Johnsonville have all the services Khandallah has, and also contain larger facilities, so do not require such support. The current supermarket and retail shops, plus services including medical, education, recreation, etc. are all small and are at capacity right now. The road the retail centre is on is a constrained one-lane road.  They therefore will not support the increased demand coming from the significant medium density development proposed by 14m zones.	Seeks that Khandallah is moved to Height control Area 1 (11m) under MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2: For multi-unit housing or a retirement village: or Other buildings and structures).	Reject.	No.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.24	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	Considers that the Western Side of Kelburn Parade, especially #64 Kelburn Parade should have maximum building height increased because:  - It is close to the transport network, employment opportunities and social infrastructure. - Larger building heights would support additional housing for the benefit of those utilising the university.  [See original submission for full details]	Seeks that Standard MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2) is amended so that the western side of Kelburn Parade has a maximum height limit of 21m as a permitted activity.	Reject.	No.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.25	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	Considers this dual-standard approach is unnecessary, and that the more permissive height standard in the MRZ should be enabled irrespective of scale of the development.	Seeks that standards MRZ-S1 (Building height control 1) and MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2) building height control are combined so that there are not different height standards for 1-3 residential units and multi unit developments.	Reject.	No.
Johanna Carter	296.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2...) is amended to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.	Reject.	No.
Wilma Sherwin	306.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	Opposes 14m Height Limit in Khandallah under MRZ-S2 and wants development heights kept to 11m. Heights of 14m are out of character for what is an outer suburb.	Opposes Khandallah being classified as MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control) - Height Area 2 (14m).	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wilma Sherwin	306.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	Opposes 14m Height Limit in Khandallah under MRZ-S2 and wants development heights kept to 11m. Heights of 14m are out of character for what is an outer suburb.	Seeks that Khandallah be classified as MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control) - Height Area 1 (11m).	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.132	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose in part	Supports MRZ-S2 and the additional building height that it enables for retirement villages located in the Height Area 2 to the extent it is consistent with the MDRS. However the standard fails to provide for roof variation height.	Opposes MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2) and seeks amendment.	Accept.	Yes.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.133	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	Supports MRZ-S2 and the additional building height that it enables for retirement villages located in the Height Area 2 to the extent it is consistent with the MDRS. However the standard fails to provide for roof variation height.	Amend MRZ-S2 to provide for roof variation height in line with the MDRS.	Accept.	Yes.
Waka Kotahi	370.311	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support	Standard MRZ-S2 is supported as it provides for up to four storeys for multi-units.	Retain Standard MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2: 1.For multi-unit...) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.407	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	MRZ-S2 is opposed as it offers two separate height standards, and should be deleted. An amendment to MRZ-S1 is sought to allow that standard to cover all areas and provide for greater height limits in areas with high accessibility to public transport, commercial amenity and community services.	Delete MRZ-S2 (Building height control 2: 1. For multi-unit housing or a retirement village; or 2. Other buildings and structures.) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.24	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	Detrimental impacts arising from excessive ratios of height to boundary.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	F584.71	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZS2	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	F5126.136	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Not specified	The RVA does not oppose this submission point but seeks that the changes it sought to MRZ-S2 are incorporated in this change in accordance with the MDRS.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	F5128.136	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Not specified	Ryman does not oppose this submission point but seeks that the changes it sought to MRZ-S2 are incorporated in this change in accordance with the MDRS.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.	Reject.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.32	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Support in part	Supports the 11m height limit that is proposed to be applied to sites across the Medium Density Residential zone.	Retain provision, subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.	Accept.	Yes.
Metlifecare Limited	413.33	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Amend	Considers that retire village buildings should be able to be established up to three storeys (or 11m) excluding any pitched roof, rather than the Height Area 1 limit that has been applied.  This is consistent with the minimum building height anticipated by the Amendment Act. This also allows the design of retirement villages to be in keeping with the surrounding area as they can have variable roof pitches.	Amend the Height Area 1 limit to read as follows:  <u>11m above ground level, except that 50% of a building's roof in elevation, measured vertically from the junction between wall and roof, may exceed the heights above by 1 metre, where the entire roof slopes 15° or more.</u>	Accept.	Yes.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	Considers that 21m height are unnecessary in Newtown. Residential streets outside the suburban centre should be be zoned medium density.	Opposes Newtown being classified as HRZ-S2 (Building height control 2 for multi-unit housing or a retirement village).	Accept in part.	Yes.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.22	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	Considers that 14m height are unnecessary in Newtown and should be reduced to 11m.	Opposes Newtown being classified as MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control) - Height Area 2 (14m).	Accept in part.	Yes.
Newtown Residents' Association	440.23	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose	Considers that 14m height are unnecessary in Berhampore and should be reduced to 11m.	Opposes Berhampore being classified as MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control) - Height Area 2 (14m).	Accept in part.	Yes.
Catharine Underwood	481.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose in part	Considers that the current height control areas in Brooklyn should be removed until a proper character/heritage assessment has been completed. 11 metres is too tall for most of the Brooklyn area and doesn't appear to take topography into consideration or the existing street scape. There are a few protected buildings in Brooklyn, but no character precinct compared to other suburbs. Brooklyn has some older well built houses and street scapes that are worth the protection.	Seeks that MRZ-S2 (Height control area 1) of 11m be removed in Brooklyn, until a character/heritage assessment has been completed.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Catharine Underwood	481.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S2	Oppose in part	Considers that the current height control areas in Brooklyn should be removed until a proper character/heritage assessment has been completed. 14 metres is too tall for most of the Brooklyn area and doesn't appear to take topography into consideration or the existing street scape. There are a few protected buildings in Brooklyn, but no character precinct compared to other suburbs. Brooklyn has some older well built houses and street scapes that are worth the protection, such as McKinley Crescent, Jefferson Street and Todman Street.	Seeks that MRZ-S2 (Height control area 2) of 14m be removed in Brooklyn, until a character/heritage assessment has been completed.	Reject.	No.
James Barber	56.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Oppose	Considers that there should be no height in relation to boundary requirements for low to medium density housing.	Delete MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) in its entirety. [Inferred Decision Requested]	Reject.	No.
Ann Mallinson	81.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Not specified	Considers that developers should not be allowed to build without a requirement not to intrude on the sunlight of neighbouring buildings. The extra heating that will be used by the affected buildings will badly affect our carbon emissions.	Not Specified.	Reject.	No.
Interprofessional Trust	96.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Oppose	Considers that recession plane requirements should be removed from the PDP.	Seeks that MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) is deleted.	Reject.	No.
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential tandard recommendations.	Reject.	No.
Richard W Keller	232.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards	Reject.	No.
Wellington City Council	266.138	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	Considers there is a need to amend exemptions to MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) to enable minor 'height in relation to boundary' intrusions.	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) exemptions as follows:  This standard does not apply to: a. (...) b. (...) c. (...); <u>and</u> d. <u>Solar panel and heating components attached to a building provided these do not exceed the height by more than 500mm; and</u> e. <u>Satellite dishes, antennas, aerials, chimneys, flues, architectural or decorative features (e.g. finials, spires) provided that none of these exceed 1m in diameter and do not exceed the height by more than 1m measured vertically.</u>	Accept.	Yes.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.186	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	As per the previous two submission points, seeks an exemption for hose drying towers regarding height in relation to boundary standards.	Supports MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary), with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.187	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	As per the previous two submission points, seeks an exemption for hose drying towers regarding height in relation to boundary standards.	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows:  ...  This standard does not apply to:  ...  c. Existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site; <del>and</del> d. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; <u>and</u> d. Hose drying towers up to 15m in height.	Reject.	No.
Johanna Carter	296.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone.  Considers that the height in relation to boundary should be modified to take into account the orientation of the boundary.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) is amended to take into account boundary orientation to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.	Reject.	No.
James Coyle	307.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Support	Recession planes are supported as long as building height, length and front yards feel appropriate.	Retain MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part.	No.



Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Khoi Phan	326.25	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Oppose	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Delete MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.134	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	Supports MRZ-S3 to the extent it is consistent with the MDRS. However, it is considered that additional exclusions should be integrated with the standard to reflect that some developments may occur adjacent to less sensitive zones.	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) so that it does not apply to boundaries adjoining open space and recreation zones, commercial and mixed use zones, and special purpose zones.	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.312	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Support	Standard MRZ-S3 is supported as it is consistent with the MDRS.	Retain Standard MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.353	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Support	Considers that MRZ-S3 is reasonable in terms of enabling development whilst providing for some mitigation of shading on adjacent properties.	Retain MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.408	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Support in part	MRZ-S3 is generally supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.25	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Oppose	Detrimental impacts arising from excessive ratios of height to boundary.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.409	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S3 should be amended to recognise the amended height limits sought through the amendment to MRZ-S1 and ensure development is suitably enabled. An amendment is also sought to remove reference to MRZ-S2 which is opposed.	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: 1. For any site where MRZ-S1 or MRZ-S2.1.a applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries, as shown in Diagram 2 below ; ... 2. For any site where MRZ-S2.1.b MRZ-S1.2 applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 5 6 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries; and ...	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.26	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Oppose	Detrimental impacts arising from excessive ratios of height to boundary.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.72	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZS3	Oppose	Greater Wellington disagree with the submitter that the flood hazard maps should be removed from the Proposed District Plan and instead be held in a nonstatutory GIS.	Disallow / Seeks that all flood hazard maps are included in the Proposed District Plan	Reject.	No.
Kirsty Woods	437.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	Considers that the current standards for Medium Density Residential fail to address effects adequately, including loss of sunlight. Heights from which recession planes on the southern boundary of a new development are measured should also be adjusted down to minimise loss of sun from the north of neighbouring properties.	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows: 1. For any site where MRZ-S1 or MRZ-S2.1.a applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 4 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries, as shown in Diagram 2 below its northern boundary, and 2 metres vertically above ground level along its southern, eastern and western boundaries; [amendment to diagram will be required] 2. For any site where MRZ-S2.1.b applies: no part of any building or structure may project beyond a 60° recession plane measured from a point 5 metres vertically above ground level along all boundaries its northern boundary, and 2 metres vertically along its eastern, western and southern boundaries; and	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Newtown Residents' Association	440.24	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that MRZ-S3 should be amended, as it is too limited and does not provide enough protection from shade. It is considered that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Buildings not directly adjacent to the park or otherwise separated from the park boundary can still cast a shadow across an open space.</li> <li>- Height in relation to boundary controls do not prevent the remaining bulk of the building from casting significant shade.</li> <li>- The days and hours this standard applies are too restrictive. the 30% shade limit will often be reached with only minor changes to the maximum permitted height between 10am to 3pm at either of the equinoxes.</li> <li>- Peak usage for primary and secondary school aged children is after school, so 3pm is too early for them; the time should extend to at least 4pm and preferably 4.30pm.</li> </ul> <p>Carrara Park has two boundaries where adjacent properties are MRZ (14m). Despite the height in relation to boundary standard (5m x 60° recession plane) that applies to development on these properties, the park may not be protected enough from shade.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. Where the boundary forms part of a legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way, the height in relation to boundary applies from the farthest boundary of that legal right of way, entrance strip, access site, or pedestrian access way.</p> <p>4. <u>For any site where MRZ-S1, MRZ-S2.1.a or MRZ-S2.1.b applies that is located within 60m of a site in the Natural Open Space Zone, Open Space Zone, or Sport and Active Recreation Zone: all buildings and structures must be designed and located to maintain sunlight access to a minimum of 70% of the open space site area during 10am to 4.30pm at either of the equinoxes (i.e. 21 March or 23 September) and at midwinter i.e. 23 June.</u></p> <p>...</p>	Reject.	No.
Jonathan Markwick	490.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that in MRZ, all height-to-boundary or recession plane controls for sites with a street frontage of less than 15m should be scrapped to ensure that these rules do not prevent development on small sites.</p>	Amend MRZ-S3 (Height in relation to boundary) to remove all height-to-boundary or recession plane controls for sites with a street frontage of less than 15m	Reject.	No.
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S3	Oppose	<p>Oppose those parts of Jonathon Markwick's submission that seeks to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.</p>	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Karen Serjeantson	43.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	<p>Considers that one side of the house should be allowed a five to six metre 'breathing'/'virtual road' space.</p>	Seeks that a yard separation of 5-6 metres is provided along one boundary (inferred decision requested).	Reject.	No.
James Barber	56.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	<p>Considers that there should be no set-back requirements in low to medium density housing.</p>	Delete MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) in its entirety. [Inferred Decision Requested]	Reject.	No.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.85	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	<p>Rejects the deletion of yard setback standards. For sites adjoining the rail corridor, setbacks ensure that people can use and maintain their land and buildings safely without needing to extend out into the railway corridor, minimising the risks of physical interference on railway operations and health and safety hazards on these residents.</p> <p>Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.</p>	Disallow	Accept in part.	Yes.
James Barber	56.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	<p>Prefers housing opening to street, as opposed to a 1.5m courtyard surrounded by high fencing.</p> <p>Setback space can otherwise be used for communal or private greenspaces.</p>	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) so that front and side yard requirements are removed for all developments in the MRZ. [Inferred Decision Requested]	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.86	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	Rejects the deletion of yard setback standards. For sites adjoining the rail corridor, setbacks ensure that people can use and maintain their land and buildings safely without needing to extend out into the railway corridor, minimising the risks of physical interference on railway operations and health and safety hazards on these residents.  Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow	Accept in part.	Yes.
Tim Bright	75.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that buildings and structures must be set back from the relevant boundary by the minimum depth listed.	Seeks that the yard setbacks at MRZ-S4 are reinstated for developments of one to three units. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept.	Yes.
Nico Maiden	77.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Support in part	Considers smaller front setbacks will allow for bigger backyards and better streetscapes.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified with respect to 1-3 units, with no front yard requirement.	Reject.	No.
Nico Maiden	77.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers smaller front setbacks will allow for bigger backyards and better streetscapes.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) with respect to 4 or more units, with the front yard requirement reduced to 1 metre or less.	Reject.	No.
David Stephen	82.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that the front and side boundary setbacks in the MRZ should be reinstated.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, with requirement to provide front and side yards for developments of 1 to 3 units.	Accept in part.	No.
Hugh Good	90.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Support	Considers that Medium Density front and side yard setbacks should not be reinstated.	Supports removal of front and side yards in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.
Ian Law	101.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that the front and side boundary setbacks in the MRZ should be reinstated.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, with requirement to provide front and side yards for developments of 1 to 3 units. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part.	No.
Pam Wilson	120.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, with requirement to provide front and side yards for developments of 1 to 3 units [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part.	No.
AdamsonShaw	137.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S4 should be amended as the current standards in the Operative District Plan are more permissive than the PDP yard/setback standards.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) so that the front setback is 1.5 metres, or 10 metres less half the width of the road, which ever is the lesser.	Reject.	No.
AdamsonShaw	137.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S4 should be amended as the current standards in the Operative District Plan are more permissive than the PDP yard/setback standards.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) so that there is no side or rear yard setback requirement except that, a minimum width of 1 metre must be maintained between buildings where a residential building (other than an accessory building) on an adjoining site is sited less than 1 metre from the boundary.	Reject.	No.
Janice Young	140.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that the front and side yard setbacks should be reinstated in the MRZ.	Seeks that the front and side yard set-backs at MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) are reinstated for developments of 1 to 3 units.	Accept in part.	No.
Grant Buchan	143.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Support	Considers that front and side setbacks should be removed. Front yards rarely get used as living space and the side areas of buildings is simply dead space.  Many of the housing typologies that have existed, without complaint, in Wellington for 100 or more years have directly fronted the street or shared walls with adjacent houses or other buildings.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified (with no Front or Side setbacks for MRZ houses of 1-3 storeys). [Inferred decision requested].	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
David Stevens	151.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Opposes the removal of front and side yard setbacks for all MRZ and other developments.  Considers that existing homeowners have a fundamental right to sunlight and reasonable privacy on their sections. Without front and side yard setbacks, Medium Density development will impact on the quality of life for these existing homeowners, as well as having a potentially significant reduction on property values.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, with requirement to provide front and side yards for developments of 1 to 3 units.  [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part.	No.
Vivienne Morrell	155.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that more of a transition zone than 1m is allowed for between Character Precincts or Heritage areas and other zones.	Reject.	No.
Cameron Vannisselroy	157.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards	Reject.	No.
Zaffa Christian	174.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	Opposes MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, which allows the ability to be able to build to the fence/boundary line.  Opposes this plan based on the recommendations made by Michael Fowler that one metre needs to be maintained in order to minimise damage in an earthquake.  Building this close with high-medium rise buildings, also contravenes the sunshine clause currently being upheld by the environmental commission.	Opposes MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, in relation to developments of 1-3 household units.	Reject.	No.
Jon Gaupset	175.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Opposes MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, which allows the ability to be able to build to the fence/boundary line.  Opposes this plan based on the recommendations made by Michael Fowler that one metre needs to be maintained in order to minimise damage in an earthquake.  Building this close with high-medium rise buildings, also contravenes the sunshine clause currently being upheld by the environmental commission.	Opposes MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, in relation to developments of 1-3 household units.	Reject.	No.
Avryl Bramley	202.40	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that this has been the case in the past and has been a recipe for disaster leaving individual homeowners trying to wrench enforcement compliance out of builders who think they have a right to trespass on adjoining properties and or demolish structures they do not own.	Seeks that MRZ-S4 is amended to require boundary setbacks.  [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Avryl Bramley	202.41	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that this has been the case in the past and has been a recipe for disaster leaving individual homeowners trying to wrench enforcement compliance out of builders who think they have a right to trespass on adjoining properties and or demolish structures they do not own.	Seeks reinstatement of side yards in residential areas.  [Inferred reinstatement of front and side yards for 1 - 3 units in MRZ-S4].	Accept in part.	No.
Monique Zorn	205.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that the removal of front yard standards reduces the ability to meet the objectives and policies in the MRZ. 11m high developments on front boundaries are more appropriate in central city, centres and inner residential areas. Construction of buildings on the front boundary of a property creates risks and hazards for footpath users, such as doors opening onto streets and garages opening directly onto paths.  Buildings on the front boundaries undermines the streets amenity.  The residential design guide leans positively towards a landscaped and active front yard, not an absence of a front yard.  The side yard standard has the effect of allowing 11m maximum height to be closer to the neighbouring property, reducing neighbours residential amenity.  The removal of the side yard standard also reduces the practical utility area in which to put rubbish bins, bikes or household goods, rear property access, maintenance of side properties without trespassing and may reduce emergency service access.  The removal of side yard standards changes the way utilities can be configured and laid.  The removal of this side yard standard of 1m across all residential zones will compromise residential amenity and good neighbourly relations.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) so that front and side yard requirements apply for 1 - 3 residential units.	Accept in part.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Russell Taylor	224.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that multi unit developments need to be encouraged	Seeks that MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) not apply to multi unit developments.	Reject.	No.
Richard W Keller	232.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards	Reject.	No.
Victoria Stace	235.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that yard setbacks enable adjacent property owners of wooden structures gain access for repairs and maintenance to their structures.	Seeks that MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) is amended to require 1.5m front yard setback and 1m side yard setback for all properties in the zone, including sites with 1 - 3 dwellings.	Accept in part.	No.
Paul Ridley-Smith	245.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Support in part	Supports the minimum yard setbacks of 1.5m (front yard) and 1m (side yards) in all residential zones. Considers that this enables adjacent property owners of wooden structures gain access for repairs and maintenance to their structures.	Supports MRZ-S4 (Building setbacks) with amendment.	Accept in part.	No.
Paul Ridley-Smith	245.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that the minimum yard setbacks of 1.5m (front yard) and 1m (side yards) should apply in all residential zones as this enables adjacent property owners of wooden structures gain access for repairs and maintenance to their structures.	Seeks that MRZ-S4 is amended to require 1.5m front yard setback and 1m side yard setback for all properties in the zone, including sites with 1 - 3 dwellings.  [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part.	No.
Wellington City Council	266.139	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers it necessary amend the standard so it only relates to 4+ units. Add exemption to standard for uncovered decks and uncovered structures no more than 500mm in height above ground level and eaves up to 600mm in width.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) exemptions as follows:  This standard does not apply to: a. <u>Developments of 1-3 household units with respect to the front and side yard set-back requirements;</u> b. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites where a common wall is proposed; <del>and</del> c. Fences or standalone walls; c. <u>Uncovered decks and uncovered structures no more than 500mm in height above ground level;</u> d. <u>Eaves up to 600mm in width;</u> e. Multi-unit housing; and f. Retirement villages.	Accept in part.	Yes.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS72.87	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	Rejects exempting 1-3 dwellings from complying with yard setback standards. For sites adjoining the rail corridor, setbacks ensure that people can use and maintain their land and buildings safely without needing to extend out into the railway corridor, minimising the risks of physical interference on railway operations and health and safety hazards on these residents.  Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Onslow Residents Community Association	283.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Opposes the removal of MRZ front and side yard setbacks.  It is important that the District Plan distinguishes the outer suburbs amenity from the inner city and metropolitan areas in order to retain choices for the city residents, to do otherwise destroys existing character for no reasonable gain in development capacity.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) is amended to require 1.5m front yard setback and 1m side yard setback for all properties, including sites with 1 - 3 dwellings.  [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part.	No.
Johanna Carter	296.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone.  Considers that the yard standard needs to be revised to provide for better privacy between residential units/sites.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) is amended to increase setbacks to improve privacy between homes.	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wilma Sherwin	306.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that the front and side boundary setbacks in the MRZ should be reinstated.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, with requirement to provide front and side yards for developments of 1 to 3 units.	Accept in part.	No.
James Coyle	307.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that resource consent should be required when front yards are larger than 4m and less than 1.5m for all building types.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified, with requirement to require resource consents for front yards larger than 4m and less than 1.5m	Reject.	No.
James Coyle	307.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that front yard design be specific depending on the orientation of the street.	Reject.	No.
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.25	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S4 should be amended to have an exception for low decks or eaves. Both the front & side yard requirements are more restrictive than current rules. There are also no exceptions for low decks or eaves. A wall 1m clear of the boundary with an eave up to 600 wide above is consistent with other regulatory requirements, so keeping the side yard requirement but allowing a 600 eave (as at GRUZ-S4) would be reasonable, as would that provision's allowance for low decks.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: a. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; <del>and</del> b. Fences or standalone walls; <del>and</del> c. <u>Uncovered decks no more than 500mm in height above ground level; and</u> d. Eaves up to 600mm in width.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Khoi Phan	326.26	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows:  Yard Minimum depth Front <del>1.5 metres</del> <u>1.0 metre</u> Side <del>1 metre</del> <u>0.5 metre</u> Rear <del>1 metre</del> <u>0.5 metre</u> (excluded on corner sites) ....	Reject.	No.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	F572.88	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S5	Oppose	Seeks side and rear setbacks from the rail corridor for health and safety reasons. Setbacks ensure that people can use and maintain their land and buildings safely without needing to extend out into the railway corridor, minimising the risks of physical interference on railway operations and health and safety hazards on these residents.  Considers the relief sought should be declined because it a) will not promote the sustainable management of the natural and physical resources in Wellington City, and is therefore contrary to, or inconsistent with, Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA and the Amendment Act; (b) is inconsistent with other relevant planning documents, including the Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement and National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020; (c) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (d) will not avoid, remedy or mitigate actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; (e) will not enable the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people of Wellington City; and (f) is not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the Proposed Plan in terms of section 32 of the RMA.	Disallow	Accept in part.	Yes.
Mt Cook Mobilised	331.13	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that There should be enough space in the side-yard, or backyard, to allow for the placement of a domestic emergency water tank, along with space to sit and enjoy the outdoors. A 1,000 litre tank is likely to be 1m wide, and the PDP proposes 1m side-yard setback requirements only. Sufficient space is needed to be able to walk past a water tank.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to allow for a 1m wide emergency water tank to fit in a side yard.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.135	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Support	Supports MRZ-S4 and the boundary setbacks which reflect the setback density standard of the Act.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.313	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Support in part	Standard MRZ-S4 is supported, but amendment is sought.	Retain Standard MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.314	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that all boundary setbacks should have immediate legal effect to align with the MDRS requirements, and to avoid confusion where boundary setbacks are applied from both the operative and district plan. Notes that the intention of the NPS-UD is to enable urban environments to evolve and change, enabled by the national standards.	Seeks to amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to ensure it has immediate legal effect.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.354	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that the boundary setbacks do not provide for efficient use of land, and will continue to perpetuate the poor land use practice of infill without regard to long term liveability. The submitter seeks that the requirement for a frontage setback be removed, along with side yard requirements. The submitter seeks a greater rear yard set back which they consider will help get our medium and high density zones on a track towards a better, more efficient yet useable urban form for the years to come.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to: - Remove the minimum depth front yard requirement - Remove the side yard requirement for the first 20m from the street frontage to the back. - Increase the rear yard requirement to 8m.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.410	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Support	MRZ-S4 is supported.	Retain MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.119	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor.  The Proposed Plan enables a 1m setback from side and rear boundaries shared with the rail corridor under MRZ-S4, increasing the risk that poles, ladders, or even ropes for abseiling equipment, could protrude into the rail corridor and increasing the risk of collision with a train or electrified overhead lines.  KiwiRail consider that a 5m setback would be more appropriate in providing for vehicular access to the rear of buildings (e.g. a cherry picker) and allowing for scaffolding to be erected safely. An increased setback would provide for the unhindered operation of buildings, including higher rise structures and for the safer use of outdoor deck areas at height. This in turn fosters visual amenity, as lineside properties can be regularly maintained.  KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows:  1. Buildings and structures must be set back from the relevant boundary by the minimum depth listed in the yards table below:  <u>Yard Boundary</u> Minimum depth Front                                      1.5 metres Side                                        1 metre Rear                                        1 metre (excluded on corner sites) <u>Rail corridor</u> 5 metres	Accept in part.	Yes.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.33	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the relief sought; a considerably reduced set back would provide adequate space for maintenance activities within sites adjacent to the rail network. In doing so, it will continue to protect the safe, efficient, and effective operation of the rail infrastructure while balancing the cost on landowners.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Donna Yule	421.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	Opposes having no residential minimum boundaries space of at least 1 metre.  No consideration has been given to the geographical location of each individual suburb, its terrain and orientation to the sun. For suburbs that are built in a north south direction with hills either side and the main housing is on the flat, any 3 storey building will cast a significant shadow over many properties.  Many more 3 storey development means a whole suburb except for those on the hills will be in permanent shadows.  Added to that no space between properties, no outside areas to enjoy a little privacy. These suburbs will become sunless undesirable transitional suburbs where people will only stay a short time until the can afford to move elsewhere with sun & outdoor space.	Not specified.	Accept in part.	No.
Johnsonville Community Association	429.32	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that one major recent decision by the Council has been to remove the building front and side setback requirements in the current District Plan. Permitting buildings onto the boundary is a significant loss of neighbourhood amenity and is likely to further reduce the natural light next to high buildings.	Seeks that MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) is amended to require 1.5m front yard setback and 1m sideyard setback for all properties in the zone, including sites with 1 - 3 dwellings.  [Inferred Decision Requested]	Accept in part.	No.
Meredith Robertshaw	444.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Seeks that MRZ-S4 has front and side yard boundaries retained to retain existing streetscape and visual amenity effects; and minimise potential dominance, lack of privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites.  I seek the reinstatement of front and side yard boundaries for:  a. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; b. Fences or standalone walls.  Considers that this will ensure that space between separate buildings will be retained, and increase the amenity value for neighbourhoods where medium density building is allowed.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to reinstate the front and side yard set-backs for developments of 1 to 3 units.	Accept in part.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Meredith Robertshaw	444.5	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	<p>Seeks that MRZ-S4 has front and side yard boundaries retained to retain existing streetscape and visual amenity effects; and minimise potential dominance, lack of privacy and shading effects on adjoining sites.</p> <p>Seeks the reinstatement of front and side yard boundaries for:</p> <p>a. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; b. Fences or standalone walls.</p> <p>Considers that this will ensure that space between separate buildings will be retained, and increase the amenity value for neighbourhoods where medium density building is allowed.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p><del>This standard does not apply to:</del></p> <p><del>a. Site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sites or where a common wall is proposed; and</del> <del>b. Fences or standalone walls.</del></p> <p>...</p>	Reject.	No.
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers it appropriate to amend front setbacks to two metres as per the Operative District Plan.	<p>Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary Setbacks) as follows:</p> <p>Buildings and structures must be set back from the relevant boundary by the minimum depth listed in the yards table below:</p> <p>Front - <del>1.5 metres</del> 2 metres [Inferred decision requested]</p>	Reject.	No.
Catharine Underwood	481.1	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that the removal of front and side yard setbacks for medium density residential standards compliant development will negatively affect the street scape of suburban Wellington.	Seeks that front and side yard setbacks in MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) apply to residential units that comply with the medium density residential standards.	Reject.	No.
Catharine Underwood	481.23	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S4	Amend	Considers that all new buildings in the suburbs should have a minimum set back of 2m to give room for a green corridor. Side yards are a good place for rubbish bins, compost bins or sheds to store bikes and other toys. This practice should be adopted for the sake of climate change, the biodiversity crisis and emissions off setting.	Amend MRZ-S4 (Boundary setbacks) to have a minimum setbacks of 2m and at least 1.5m in the inner city.	Reject.	No.
Wellington City Council	266.140	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S5	Amend	Considers it is necessary to add exemption to standard for uncovered decks and uncovered structures no more than 500mm in height about ground level and eaves up to 600mm in width.	<p>Amend MRZ-S5 (Building coverage) as follows:</p> <p><del>This standard does not apply to:</del></p> <p><del>a. Uncovered decks and uncovered structures no more than 500mm in height above ground level; and</del> <del>b. Eaves up to 600mm in width.</del> <del>c. Multi-unit housing; and</del> <del>d. Retirement villages.</del></p>	Accept in part.	Yes.
AdamsonShaw Limited	FS1.1	MRZ-S5	Support	<p>The exemptions proposed by Wellington City Council in their submission are similar to the existing exemptions to site coverage in the Operative District Plan. However the exemption for uncovered decks and uncovered structures should be increased to being "no more than 1m in height about ground level" and "eaves up to 1m in width" as this is the current exemptions under the ODP.</p> <p>Given the topography of Wellington, most decks are greater than 500mm. Decks are used to provide flat outdoor living space and they should not count towards site coverage where they are less than 1m.</p>	<p>Amend / Amend MRZ-S5 (Building coverage) by adding the following:</p> <p>...</p> <p><del>This standard does not apply to:</del></p> <p><del>a. Uncovered decks and uncovered structures no more than 1m in height above ground level; and</del> <del>b. Eaves up to 1m in width.</del></p>	Accept.	Yes.
Johanna Carter	296.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S5	Amend	<p>Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone.</p> <p>Considers that the building coverage requirement is going from 35% to 50% is a significant increase in this zone and will have a huge impact of the feeling of openness in the area increasing overall building bulk.</p> <p>Considers that either retaining the 35% coverage but allow for a 15% deck coverage under particular conditions is a better option.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that MRZ-S5 (Building coverage) is amended from 50% to 35% to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development. An additional 15% for decks could be permitted in particular conditions.	Reject.	No.
Khoi Phan	326.27	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S5	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	<p>Amend MRZ-S5 (Building coverage) as follows:</p> <p>1. Maximum building coverage must not exceed <del>50%</del> 70% of the net site area.</p>	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.136	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S5	Support	Supports MRZ-S5 and the maximum building coverage which reflects the building coverage density standard of the Act.	Retain MRZ-S5 (Building coverage) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.



Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Waka Kotahi	370.315	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S5	Support	Standard MRZ-S5 is supported as it is consistent with the MDRS.	Retain Standard MRZ-S5 (Building coverage) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.411	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S5	Support	MRZ-S5 is supported.	Retain MRZ-S5 (Building coverage) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.34	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S5	Support	Supports the maximum building coverage is 50% of the net site area.	Retain MRZ-S5 (Building Coverage) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Richard W Keller	232.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Amend	Considers that the addition of the Coalition for More Homes' alternative recommendations for outdoor living space and green space should be adopted.	Amend MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space per unit) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards	Reject.	No.
Johanna Carter	296.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Amend	Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) is amended to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.137	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from MRZ-S6.	Retain MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.138	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Amend	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from MRZ-S6. If retirement villages are regulated by the standard, the standard should be amended to enable the communal outdoor living spaces of retirement villages to count towards the amenity standard	Should MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) be amended to be subject to retirement villages following notification, seeks that the MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) is amended as follows:  <u>For retirement units, clause 1 and 2 apply with the following modifications:</u> <u>a. the outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and</u> <u>b. a retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible locations in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space.</u>	Reject.	No.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Envirowaste Services Ltd	373.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Amend	Considers that bin storage should have a specific and acknowledged location on site that is outside an outdoor living space.	Amend MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) as follows:  1. A residential unit at ground floor level must have an outdoor living space that is at least 20 square metres and that comprises ground floor, balcony, patio, or roof terrace space that: a. Where located at ground level, has no dimension less than 3 metres; b. Where provided in the form of a balcony, patio, or roof terrace, is at least 8 square metres and has a minimum dimension of 1.8 metres; c. Is accessible from the residential unit; d. May be: i. grouped cumulatively by area in 1 communally accessible location; or ii. located directly adjacent to the unit; and e. Is free of buildings, parking spaces, and servicing (including waste facilities) and maneuvering areas.	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.355	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Support	Considers that provision for outdoor living space is an important part of ensuring a healthy and pleasant environment for people living in higher density areas.	Retain MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.412	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Support in part	MRZ-S6 is generally supported and it is acknowledged that that this standard is directly taken from the MDRS, however seek that the standard is more enabling, but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) with amendment.	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.413	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Oppose	Considers that MRZ-S6 should be amended to be more enabling. MRZ-S13 for multi-unit housing is a more enabling outdoor living space requirement which is considered appropriate for all residential units as it provides sufficient onsite space and amenity. Amendments are sought to replace MRZ-S6 with MRZ-S13 and delete reference to multi-unit housing and retirement villages.	Delete MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) including the exclusion for multiunit housing and retirement villages and replace with MRZS13 which should then be deleted.	Reject.	No.
LIVE WELLington	F596.31	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Oppose	Opposed as existing provision for outdoor living space delivers a better outcome for residents	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Roland Sapsford	F5117.30	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Oppose	Opposed as existing provision for outdoor living space delivers a better outcome for residents.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	F5126.137	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Not specified	The RVA would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by The RVA within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.	Accept in part.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	F5128.137	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Not specified	Ryman would support the intent of the relief sought in this submission subject to the relief sought by Ryman within the primary submission for retirement villages to be excluded.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.	Accept in part.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.35	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S6	Support	Considers the outdoor living space (per unit) and outlook space (per unit) requirements do not apply to retirement village development. This appropriately recognises that these types of developments are designed for elderly residents and generally have communal outdoor spaces (which are maintained by the village provider) rather than individual backyard or outdoor living areas that would need to be maintained by the residents.	Retain MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
AdamsonShaw	137.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S7 is one of the main limitations to intensification of development and dwelling density in the established residential areas as the requirement to provide a 4m deep outlook space is too much.  Considers that the depth of the outlook space should be reduced to 3m so that the complying outdoor living space can double as outlook space.	Amend MRZ-S7.3.a (Outlook space (per unit)) so that, if possible, the depth of the outlook space is reduced to 3m from 4m.	Reject.	No.
AdamsonShaw	137.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Support in part	Considers that the 4m width requirement is ok in MRZ-S7.	Retain the MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) 4m width requirement as notified.	Accept.	No.
Johanna Carter	296.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Amend	Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) is amended to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.139	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Support	The RVA supports the exclusion of retirement villages from MRZ-S7.	Retain MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.140	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Amend	The RVA supports the exclusion of retirement villages from MRZ-S7. If the standard is amended and retirement villages are regulated by this standard, the standard should ensure that outlook space requirements are provided that are appropriate for retirement villages.	Should MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) be amended to be subject to retirement villages following notification, seeks that the MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) is amended as follows:  <u>For retirement units, clauses 1 – 9 apply with the following modification: The minimum dimensions for a required outlook space are 1 metre in depth and 1 metre in width for a principal living room and all other habitable rooms.</u>	Accept in part.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.356	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Support	Considers that provision for outdoor living space is an important part of ensuring a healthy and pleasant environment for people living in higher density areas.	Retain MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.414	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Support in part	MRZ-S7 is generally supported and it is acknowledged that that this standard is directly taken from the MDRS, however seek that the standard is more enabling, but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.415	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Oppose	Considers that MRZ-S7 should be amended to be more enabling. MRZ-S14 for multi-unit housing is a more enabling provision which provides sufficient outlook space and is considered to be appropriate for all residential units regardless of the number on a site.	Delete MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) including the exclusion for multiunit housing and retirement villages and replace with MRZS14 which should then be deleted.	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Metlifecare Limited	413.36	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Support	Considers the policy recognises that there are a range of units within a retirement village including care units where the provision of outlook space should not unnecessarily constrain the design of these care facilities.	Retain MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.23	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Oppose	Considers that MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) avoids specifying access to direct sunlight within principal living rooms.  The very small living spaces allowed for under MRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing), i.e. 35m2 to 55m2, necessitate a counterbalancing measure to ensure that direct sunlight prevents claustrophobia and depression from living in confined shaded spaces. In Wellington direct sunlight enjoyed indoors is crucially important.  [Refer to original submission for full detail].	Seeks that provision is made to ensure that principal living rooms enjoy a minimum of two hours of direct sunlight from June to August.	Reject.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.24	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S7	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) avoids specifying access to direct sunlight within principal living rooms.  The very small living spaces allowed for under MRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing), i.e. 35m2 to 55m2, necessitate a counterbalancing measure to ensure that direct sunlight prevents claustrophobia and depression from living in confined shaded spaces. In Wellington direct sunlight enjoyed indoors is crucially important.  [Refer to original submission for full detail].	Seeks that provision is made to ensure that principal living rooms enjoy a minimum of two hours of direct sunlight from June to August.	Reject.	No.
Interprofessional Trust	96.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S8	Amend	Considers that the 20% glazing standard has no support in science and that glass is not an insulating cladding.  [Refer to original submission for further details]	Seeks that the 20% glazing standard is amended to say 15-50% glass when oriented 90° of north and 20% max for other orientations, excluding shopfronts [Refer to submission for further details].	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.141	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S8	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from MRZ-S8.	Retain MRZ-S8 (Windows to street) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.142	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S8	Amend	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from MRZ-S8. If the standard is amended and retirement villages are regulated by this standard, the standard should be amended to apply to retirement units that face a public street only.	Should MRZ-S8 (Windows to street) be amended to be subject to retirement villages following notification, seeks that MRZ-S8 (Windows to street) to only apply to retirement villages that face a public street.	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.316	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S8	Support	Standard MRZ-S8 is supported as it is consistent with the MDRS.	Retain Standard MRZ-S8 (Outlook space (per unit)) as notified.	Accept.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.357	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S8	Support	Considers that MRZ-S8 will help ensure attractiveness at street level, as well as provide for passive surveillance: designing for safety is highly important in built environments.	Retain MRZ-S8 (Windows to street) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.416	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S8	Support	MRZ-S8 is supported.	Retain MRZ-S8 (Windows to street) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.37	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S8	Support	The submitter states the medium density residential standard related to window glazing does not apply to retirement village development. This standard is therefore supported.	Retain MRZ-S8 (Windows to street) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Richard W Keller	232.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S9	Amend	Considers that the addition of the Coalition for More Homes' alternative recommendations for outdoor living space and green space should be adopted.	Amend MRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) to be consistent with the Coalition for More Homes' Alternative medium density residential standards	Reject.	No.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.26	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S9	Not specified	Considers that 'landscaped area' could benefit from a definition.	Seeks clarity on the interpretation of 'landscaped area' as it relates to standard MRZ-S9 (Landscaped area).	Reject.	No.
Johanna Carter	296.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S9	Amend	Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) is amended to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.143	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S9	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from MRZ-S9.	Retain MRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.144	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S9	Amend	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from MRZ-S9. If the standard is amended and retirement villages are regulated by this standard, the standard should be amended to apply to retirement units.	Should MRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) be amended to be subject to retirement villages following notification, seeks that MRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) to only apply to retirement units.	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.358	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S9	Support	Considers that MRZ-S9 will help provide a biophilic environment for residents, along with benefits to biodiversity, pleasantness and amenity, as well as helping reduce the rate and amount of storm water run-off.	Retain MRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.417	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S9	Support	MRZ-S9 is supported.	Retain MRZ-S9 (Landscaped area) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.38	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S9	Support	The submitter states that it is appropriate that no landscape area standard applies to retirement village development. Retirement villages have well landscaped and maintained grounds for residents. Regulating this on a per unit basis would be inappropriate, and would not enable the efficient use of the site.	Retain MRZ-S9 (Landscaped areas) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Rod Halliday	25.31	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Amend	Considers that 30% permeable surface is too high, considering the MDRZ allows for 50% site coverage and other standards require 20% landscape area of grass or plants.	Seeks that the first point in MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) be amended to require a minimum of 20% of net surface area be permeable.	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Glenside Progressive Association (GPA)	FS4.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Oppose	Oppose submitter seeking to reduce permeable surface from 30% to 20%. This is because residents below the site and downstream will be adversely affected.  Housing development on Glenside West slopes should be hydrologically neutral. Because this is almost certainly not achievable, we oppose any high or medium density housing development in this area at all.  The Boffa Miskell Upper Stebbings Valley Wellington Landscape and Ecology Analysis report (2018) is very pertinent when considering this development. This report identified Glenside West as having remnant forest of high ecological values, worthy of protection.	Disallow / Seeks that the submission is disallowed to retain appropriate standard for permeable surfaces that avoids any increase in flooding or risk of slips i.e 30% permeable surface or higher.  [Refer to further submission for full decision requested]	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Heidi Snelson	FS24.9	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Oppose	Submitter is seeking to reduce mitigation requirements and responsibilities around hydraulic neutrality and permeable surface requirements in the case of storm water management at a unprecedented time of storm water damage in Wellington.  Developments should undertake more mitigation not less in all areas given climate change. Especially those posing more risk, such as steep hillsides, abutting/above key infrastructure (roading, power, water, railway), and significant streams, such as at the sites of the current and planned developments in Churton Park and Glenside West.  The Glenside West development area is downstream of both detention structures, on extremely steep hillsides, above Porirua Stream, directly above Middleton Road (State Highway 1 motorway detour route) and the North Island railway line (which runs alongside and over the Porirua Stream). This development area must be specifically required to achieve Hydraulic Neutrality. Be that through specific technological infrastructure in build design and water catchment, significant permeable surface requirements/planting. Through Large Lot Residential Only in Glenside West.	Disallow / Seeks that submission be disallowed to ensure strict adherence to hydraulic neutrality in Glenside West Development Area, and Stebbings Valley / Reedy Block Development Area. Seeks minimum standard of hydraulic neutrality required and corresponding requirement of high level of permeable surface mitigations.  Seeks that Glenside West be designated Large Lot Residential only.	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Zoe Ogilvie-Burns	131.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Anne Lian	132.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Ingo Schommer	133.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Olivier Reuland	134.14	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Grant Buchan	143.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Add a new permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring that a minimum 30-40% of sites should be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Braydon White	146.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support	Supports requirement for permeability of 30-40% of the site.	Retain MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area), such as that a minimum 30-40% of sites should be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Jill Ford	163.12	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Amos Mann	172.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Patrick Wilkes	173.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Pete Gent	179.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	
James Harris	180.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Peter Nunns	196.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Richard W Keller	232.18	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Amend MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface areas) to require a minimum of 30 – 40% permeability .	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Gabriela Roque-Worcel	234.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Wellington City Council	266.141	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Oppose in part	Considers that given this is not a building provision, but a three waters/infrastructure provision, it is more logical to locate this standard in the THW chapter. Note: MRZ-P9 (Permeable surface area) and MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) are to be relocated to THW – see new THW-P6 and THW-R7.	Delete MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) in its entirety. Consequential renumbering of standards MRZ-S11 and MRZ-S14 to reflect change in numbering. Consequential update to references in notification clauses as required.	Accept.	Yes.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.27	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	Considers that the definitions lead to unnecessary restriction on site layout and design as currently drafted.	Seeks clarity on the whether the permeable surface area standard MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) is inclusive of landscaped area.	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Johanna Carter	296.19	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Amend	Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) is amended to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.145	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support	Supports the exclusion of retirement villages from MRZ-S10.	Retain MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) as notified.	Addressed in Report 5C.	
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.359	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support	Considers that MRZ-S10 will help to reduce the rate and amount of stormwater run off.	Retain MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) as notified.	Addressed in Report 5C.	

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Henry Bartholomew Nankivell Zwart	378.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Add a new MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) permeability standard, such as that a minimum 30-40% of sites should be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.418	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support in part	MRZ-S10 is supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) with amendment.	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.419	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S10 should be amended so that that reference to multi-unit housing is deleted, as this concept is not supported.	Amend MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: <del>a. Multi-unit housing; and</del> b. Retirement villages.	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Matthew Tamati Reweti	394.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Add a new MRZ permeability standard, such as that a minimum 30-40% of sites should be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	
David Cadman	398.15	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Add a new MRZ permeability standard, such as that a minimum 30-40% of sites should be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Emma Osborne	410.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Metlifecare Limited	413.39	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support	The submitter states that no permeable surface area standard applies to retirement village development. This is appropriate as it will enable the efficient use of the site.	Retain MRZ-S10 (Permeable surface area) as notified.	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Luke Stewart	422.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Alicia Hall on behalf of Parents for Climate Aotearoa	472.17	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S10	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks a permeability standard in the Medium Density Residential Zone requiring a minimum 30-40% of a site to be permeable (including permeable pavers / gravel etc).	Addressed in Report 5C.	
Rod Halliday	25.32	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Amend	Considers that the maximum height of 2m for fences and standalone walls is too low.	Seeks that MRZ-S11.2.b (Fences and standalone walls) be amended to allow a fence to be 1.5m in height before the 50% visually transparency requirement applies.	Reject.	No.
Rod Halliday	25.33	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Amend	Considers that the maximum height for fences and standalone walls needs to specifically exclude retaining walls.	Seeks that MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) be amended to exclude retaining walls from maximum height limits of fences and standalone walls.	Reject.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.188	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Support in part	Considers it important that the erection of fences and walls will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Fences and walls should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. FENZ therefore seeks an amendment to provide for this.	Supports MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls), with amendment.	Accept.	Yes.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.189	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Amend	Considers it important that the erection of fences and walls will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Fences and walls should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. FENZ therefore seeks an amendment to provide for this.	Amend MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) as follows: 1. Any fence or standalone wall, or combination of these structures, must not <del>exceed</del> : a. <u>Exceed</u> a maximum height of 2m above ground level where within 1m of any side or rear boundary; b. <u>Obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut off valves, or other emergency response facilities.</u> 2. On a front boundary or in a front boundary setback any fence or standalone wall, or combination of these structures, must not <del>exceed</del> : a. <u>Exceed</u> a maximum height of 2m above ground level; and b. Any part of a fence or standalone wall above 1.2m in height must be 50% visually transparent for its entire length, as shown in Diagram 4 below. c. <u>Obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities.</u>	Accept.	Yes.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Johanna Carter	296.20	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Amend	Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) is amended to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.	Reject.	No.
Johanna Carter	296.21	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S11 (Fences) needs to allow building along busy roads to prevent traffic noise.	Seeks amendment to MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) to allow for provision for close-board fences along busy roads.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.146	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Support in part	Supports the 2m height standard for fences/walls but considers an exclusion is required for temporary fences/walls e.g. for noise mitigation during construction.	Retain MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.147	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Amend	Supports the 2m height standard for fences/walls but considers an exclusion is required for temporary fences/walls e.g. for noise mitigation during construction.	Amend MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) to exclude temporary fences/walls from the standard.	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.360	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Amend	Considers that solid fences of 2m in height detract from neighbourhood interactions, and create unsafe environments. Seeks that fences should be no higher than 1.2m in height at the street frontage. Add provision for 2m height where the height above 1.2m is 50% visually transparent on fences abutting public walkways.	Amend MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) to require fences on the front boundary are no greater than 1.2m in height.	Accept.	Yes.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.361	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Amend	Considers that solid fences of 2m in height detract from neighbourhood interactions, and create unsafe environments. Seeks that fences should be no higher than 1.2m in height at the street frontage. Add provision for 2m height where the height above 1.2m is 50% visually transparent on fences abutting public walkways.	Amend MRZ-S11 (Fences and standalone walls) to require that fences abutting a public walkway be no more than 2m in height with the area above 1.2m being 50% visually transparent.	Accept.	Yes.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.55	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Oppose	Concerned that the height of fences at which they are allowed as permitted activities should be lowered.  High fences that cannot be seen through, are a public space problem for safety reasons.	Seeks amendment to standard MRZ-S11 (Fences and Standalone walls).	Reject.	No.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.56	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S11	Amend	Concerned that the height of fences at which they are allowed as permitted activities should be lowered.  High fences that cannot be seen through, are a public space problem for safety reasons.	Seeks that MRZ-S11 is amended so that the fences up to 1m can be built with any material along a boundary with public space, and where higher than 1 metre they must be of a material that allows pedestrians to see through it from the adjacent path.	Reject.	No.
Property Council New Zealand	338.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S12	Amend	Considers that minimum unit sizes, coupled with increased height density, run the risk of buildings that are smaller in floor space but greater in height. The overall design outcome should be considered so that adverse design outcomes for small, skinny buildings with less total floor space be avoided.	Seeks that overall design outcomes be considered when setting minimum unit sizes in MRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing).	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.420	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S12	Support in part	MRZ-S12 is supported but an amendment is sought.	Retain MRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.421	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S12	Amend	Considers that MRZ-S12 should be amended to allow for smaller floor areas for studio units and for simplicity, a minimum floor area for 1 or bedrooms.	Amend MRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing) as follows:  <b>Residential Unit Type      Minimum Net Floor Area</b> a. Studio unit                      35m <sup>2</sup> 30m <sup>2</sup> 2. 1 or more bedroom unit      40m <sup>2</sup> 3. 2+ bedroom unit                55m <sup>2</sup>	Reject.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.40	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S12	Support	The submitter states these provisions apply to multi-unit housing, not retirement villages. This is supported. It appropriately recognises that retirement villages contain a range of different units, including dementia and care units and/or serviced apartment units which are generally smaller than residential units established in multi-unit housing developments, due to the nature of the residents and their particular needs.	Retain MRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.71	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S12	Oppose	Opposes MRZ-S12 as the submitter considers: - Minimum residential unit sizes restrict the ability for developers to provide affordable housing choices and a diverse range of housing. - Occupiers are well-equipped to make their own decisions as to the type and size of dwelling. - Health, fire egress and overcrowding issues that arise from small sized dwellings are best dealt with by other legislation (e.g. Building Act 2004, Housing Improvement Regulations 1947, Residential Tenancies Act 1986). - Minimum unit sizes are not required where there are three or fewer residential units on a site (in accordance with the medium density residential standards). The submitter considers it is inconsistent to then provide minimum unit sizes for multi-unit housing and will create perverse incentives for developers. - Minimum unit sizes do not reflect the policy in HRZ-P3 to provide a range of housing sizes.	Delete MRZ-S12 (Minimum residential unit size for multi-unit housing) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Rod Halliday	25.34	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S13	Amend	Considers that communal space minimum area and dimensions would benefit from more clarification, namely a note section or an example. The assumption is that the minimum area of 10m2 is cumulative, but that the minimum dimensions remain 8m.	Clarify the intent of MRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) by adding an example or a clarification note relating to communal space minimum area and dimensions.	Accept.	Yes.
Design Network Architecture Limited	259.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S13	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Clarify MRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) "Minimum Dimension" - so that for communal shared living spaces an 8m dimension is required at only one portion of the outdoor living space, with the other dimension able to be smaller than this. i.e. not an 8m x 8m space.	Accept.	Yes.
Design Network Architecture Limited	259.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S13	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Seeks amendment to HRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) to allow 10m2 minimum area to be achieved with alternative dimensions of 5m x 2m, or 3.2m x 3.2m.	Reject.	No.
Johanna Carter	296.22	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S13	Amend	Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S1 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) is amended to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.	Reject.	No.
Rimu Architects Ltd	318.26	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S13	Amend	Considers that the outdoor living space for multi-unit housing in MRZ-S13 has large requirements. The requirement for only 10 square metres of communal outdoor living space per every 5 units fits oddly with both the much larger requirement per unit if the space is private and also the 8m minimum dimension requirement.  An 8m x 8m area, would in theory be sufficient communal space for 30 residential units with 4 square metres 'spare' increasing the allowance 5 square metres (matching the studio/1 bedroom private allowance) would leave the minimum area as adequate for 12 residential units.  There are also sites within this zone where the site width is less than 8m.	Amend MRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) as follows:  Living Space Type ... b. Communal i. For every <del>5</del> units unit  Minimum area - <del>10m2</del> 5m2  Minimum dimension - 8m except where site width is less than 8m. In that situation an area the full width of the site and 8m deep is acceptable.	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.362	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S13	Support	Considers that provision for outdoor living space is an important part of ensuring a healthy and pleasant environment for people living in higher density areas.	Retain MRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.422	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S13	Oppose	Character Precincts are opposed, as well as all related Standards. It is sought that this Standard is deleted.	Replace MRZ-S6 (Outdoor living space (per unit)) with MRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing) and delete MRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multi-unit housing).	Reject.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.41	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S13	Support	Considers that these provisions do not apply to retirement villages. This is supported. It is appropriate to recognise the needs of residents are different to those in a multi-unit housing development.	Retain MRZ-S13 (Outdoor living space for multiunit housing) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Johanna Carter	296.23	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S14	Amend	Considers that the MRZ rules one size fits approach does not adequately protect existing and future residents in the Medium Density Zone.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that MRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi unit housing) is amended to adequately control the adverse impacts that will result from higher density development.	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.363	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S14	Support	Considers that provision for outdoor living space is an important part of ensuring a healthy and pleasant environment for people living in higher density areas.	Retain MRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.423	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S14	Oppose	The submitter seeks that this standard replace MRZ-S7 as the level of outlook space proposed by this standard is appropriate for all sites not just sites developed with more than 3 residential units.	Replace MRZ-S7 (Outlook space (per unit)) with MRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) and delete MRZ-S14 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing)	Reject.	No.
Metlifecare Limited	413.42	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-S14	Support	Considers that these provisions do not apply to retirement villages. This is supported. It is appropriate to recognise the needs of residents are different to those in a multi-unit housing development.	Retain MRZ-S12 (Outlook space for multi-unit housing) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.317	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S1	Not specified	Takes a neutral position to standards that relate to the Oriental Bay Height Precinct.	Neutral position on Standard MRZ-PREC03-S1 (Boundary setbacks) and seeks to retain standard.	Accept.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.318	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S1	Support	Standard MRZ-PREC03-S1 is generally supported.	Retain Standard MRZ-PREC03-S1 (Boundary setbacks) as notified.	Accept.	No.



Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.426	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S1	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is opposed, as well as all related Standards. It is sought that this Standard is deleted.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-S1 (Boundary setbacks) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	F537.12	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S1	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill.  Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	F538.6	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S1	Oppose	Opposes elements of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	F538.28	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S1	Oppose	Oppose those parts of Kāinga Ora's submission that seeks to amend, or remove the Character Precincts in Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Don MacKay	F594.12	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S1	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.82	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S1	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-S1 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form.  The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-S1 (Boundary setbacks) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.319	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S2	Not specified	Takes a neutral position to standards that relate to the Oriental Bay Height Precinct.	Neutral position on Standard MRZ-PREC03-S2 (Height in relation to boundary) and seeks to retain standard.	Accept.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.320	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S2	Support	Standard MRZ-PREC03-S2 is generally supported.	Retain Standard MRZ-PREC03-S2 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.427	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S2	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is opposed, as well as all related Standards. It is sought that this Standard is deleted.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-S2 (Height in relation to boundary) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	F537.13	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S2	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill.  Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow	Accept.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.7	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S2	Oppose	Opposes elements of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.29	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S2	Oppose	Oppose those parts of Kāinga Ora's submission that seeks to amend, or remove the Character Precincts in Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Don MacKay	FS94.13	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZPREC03-S2	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.83	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S2	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-S2 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form.  The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-S2 (Height in relation to boundary) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Tore Hayward	170.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S3	Support	Supports the proposed height restrictions of 11m in MRZ-PREC03 for Hay Street because of NPS-UD and MRZ qualifying matters.  Considers that increasing the height limits above this would detract significantly from the public amenity for those who visit Oriental Parade and use Oriental Bay beach.  There are also health and safety considerations (slips) relevant to houses above 11 and 13 Hay Street. Intensification would increase the impact of this risk.  [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Retain MRZ-PREC03-S3 (Maximum height) as notified, with respect to the 11m height limit in Hay Street.	Reject	No.
Tore Hayward	170.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S3	Support	Supports the proposed height restrictions of 11m in MRZ-PREC03 for the narrow private road that runs off Hay Street, providing access to number 10 to 30B Hay Street and 218, 220, and 224 Oriental Parade ("Hay Street extension") because of NPS-UD and MRZ qualifying matters.  There are also health and safety considerations (slips) relevant to houses above 11 and 13 Hay Street. Intensification would increase the impact of this risk. Considers that there is a particularly strong case for this height recommendation to apply to the "Hay Street extension" due to health and safety considerations.  [Refer to original submission for full details].	Retain MRZ-PREC03-S3 (Maximum height) as notified, with respect to the 11m height limit in Hay Street.	Reject	No.
Scott Galloway & Carolyn McLean	171.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S3	Support	Supports the proposed height restrictions of 11m in MRZ-PREC03 (or lower heights) because of qualifying matters that apply to Oriental Bay residential side streets including Hay Street and Baring Street.  There are many qualifying matters relating to the steep cliff side streets which render higher levels of development inappropriate. Those matters include safety to pedestrians on unformed paths, restricted access for emergency vehicles and a long history of slips and instability of the coastal cliffs.  Furthermore, the area has a special character and historic values, and comprises an iconic landscape of very high public significance.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-S3 (Maximum height) as notified, with respect to the 11m height limit in Hay Street and Baring Street.	Reject	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.321	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S3	Not specified	Takes a neutral position to standards that relate to the Oriental Bay Height Precinct.	Neutral position on Standard MRZ-PREC03-S3 (Maximum height) and seeks to retain standard.	Accept.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.322	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S3	Support	Standard MRZ-PREC03-S3 is generally supported.	Retain Standard MRZ-PREC03-S3 (Maximum height) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.428	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S3	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is opposed, as well as all related Standards. It is sought that this Standard is deleted.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-S3 (Maximum height) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Pukepue Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.14	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S3	Oppose	<p>Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill.</p> <p>Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.</p>	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.8	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S3	Oppose	Opposes elements of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.30	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S3	Oppose	Oppose those parts of Kāinga Ora's submission that seeks to amend, or remove the Character Precincts in Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Don MacKay	FS94.14	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZPREC03-S3	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.84	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S3	Support	<p>Supports the MRZ-PREC03-S3 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form.</p> <p>The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.</p>	Retain MRZ-PREC03-S3 (Maximum height) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.429	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S4	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is opposed, as well as all related Standards. It is sought that this Standard is deleted.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-S4 (Minimum residential unit size) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Pukepue Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.15	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S4	Oppose	<p>Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill.</p> <p>Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.</p>	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.9	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S4	Oppose	Opposes elements of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.31	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S4	Oppose	Oppose those parts of Kāinga Ora's submission that seeks to amend, or remove the Character Precincts in Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Don MacKay	FS94.15	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZPREC03-S4	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow	Accept.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.85	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S4	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-S4 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form.  The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-S4 (Minimum residential unit size) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.430	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S5	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is opposed, as well as all related Standards. It is sought that this Standard is deleted.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-S5 (Outlook space) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.16	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S5	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill.  Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.10	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S5	Oppose	Opposes elements of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.32	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S5	Oppose	Oppose those parts of Kāinga Ora's submission that seeks to amend, or remove the Character Precincts in Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Don MacKay	FS94.16	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S5	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.86	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S5	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-S5 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form.  The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-S5 (Outlook space) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.364	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S6	Amend	Considers that solid fences of 2m in height detract from neighbourhood interactions, and create unsafe environments. Seeks that fences should be no higher than 1.2m in height at the street frontage. Add provision for 2m height where the height above 1.2m is 50% visually transparent on fences abutting public walkways.	Amend MRZ-PREC03-S6 (Fences and standalone walls) to require fences on the front boundary are no greater than 1.2m in height.	Accept.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.365	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S6	Amend	Considers that solid fences of 2m in height detract from neighbourhood interactions, and create unsafe environments. Seeks that fences should be no higher than 1.2m in height at the street frontage. Add provision for 2m height where the height above 1.2m is 50% visually transparent on fences abutting public walkways.	Amend MRZ-PREC03-S6 (Fences and standalone walls) to require that fences abutting a public walkway be no more than 2m in height with the area above 1.2m being 50% visually transparent.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.431	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-S6	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is opposed, as well as all related Standards. It is sought that this Standard is deleted.	Delete MRZ-PREC03-S6 (Fences and standalone walls) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.17	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-56	Oppose	Opposes walkable catchment extension - limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill.  Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- The Oriental Bay Height Precinct provides protection for significant public amenity value, for all those who use the beach and Parade, representing a large part of the Wellington population. This Height Precinct was decided after careful review by the Environment Court in 1989 and all the considerations that were carefully laid out there are relevant here.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.11	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-56	Oppose	Opposes elements of Kāinga Ora's submission that seek to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.33	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-56	Oppose	Oppose those parts of Kāinga Ora's submission that seeks to amend, or remove the Character Precincts in Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Don MacKay	FS94.17	Part 3 / Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZPREC03-56	Oppose	Considers that walkable catchment extension opposed -see above in relation to Property Council. Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the CCZ go well beyond requirements of NPSUD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values (particularly within Oriental Bay). Oppose review of the O' Bay Height precinct- see our reasons re Waka Kotahi.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Lucy Harper and Roger Pemberton	401.87	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / MRZ-PREC03-56	Support	Supports the MRZ-PREC03-56 as the submitter considers that the provisions in the medium density chapter generally allow for more of the population to live close to city and work, to enable efficient public transport and to take advantage of the existing compact city form.  The submitter supports the identification of character areas and considers the accompanying provisions enables the retention of Wellington's early development and city character while allowing for provision of housing.	Retain MRZ-PREC03-56 (Fences and standalone walls) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Tim Bright	75.4	Historical and Cultural Values / Historic Heritage / New HH	Amend	Considers that a setback of more than 1m should be required to allow for more of a transition zone between Heritage Areas or Character Precincts.	Seeks that a setback of more than 1m is required from boundaries in or adjoining Heritage Areas in the Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Anita Gude and Simon Terry	461.17	Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones / General point on Residential Zones	Amend	Considers that a height limit of 11m on properties bordering the town belt will lead to a loss of character over time and will degrade the natural backdrop that the town belt provides for the City.	Amend the rules (and associated objectives and policies) so that a height limit of 8m is applied to all properties bordering the town belt.	Reject.	No.
Antony Kitchener and Simin Littschwager	199.2	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose in part	Opposes the parts of the PDP where the northern suburbs of Crofton Downs, Ngaio and Khandallah are sacrificed for densification.	Not specified.	Reject.	No.
Scots College Incorporated	117.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 11m building height standard is supported for most of the Scots College Campus but because the Campus is large in area it is possible and desirable for new buildings with an additional 5m in height (to 16m) to be accommodated on the Campus, provided this additional building height is located with a reasonable setback distance (25m) from any boundary of the Campus, including the street boundaries. This will effectively "internalise" the effects of the additional building height to the Campus and avoid any unacceptable adverse effects on the streetscape and any residential properties. The purpose of this is also to encourage the retention of open character of the northern half of the Campus.	Seeks that the mapping is amended to apply the proposed Height Control area 3 from original submission to the area of Scots College Campus that is 25m or more away from any street boundary and any adjoining Medium Density Residential Zone boundary.	Reject.	No.
Janice Young	140.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 14m height limits in the MRZ should be removed.	Amend the mapping to remove 14m building heights in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept in part.	No.
David Stevens	151.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Opposes the surrounding area of Khandallah being medium density four storey with a height limit of 14m.	Amend the mapping to zone the area surrounding Khandallah as Medium Density Residential Zone, with a storey /11m maximum height limit throughout. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject.	No.
Ros Bignell	186.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the existing newer, infill townhouses on Lawrence Street are positioned such that they have a relatively low impact on the overall streetscape. This might be similarly possible with new 3 storey (11 metres height) townhouses or residential buildings but not with 4 storey multi dwelling buildings of up to 14 metres.	Amend the height in the mapping to 11m in Lawrence Street, Newtown.	Accept.	Yes.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Claire Nolan, James Fraser, Margaret Franken, Biddy Bunzel, Michelle Wooland, Lee Muir	FS68.23	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports submission seeking that character protections should extend to Lawrence Street, Newtown.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Jonothan and Tricia Briscoe	190.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that there is inadequate protection provided where 21m high buildings are permitted up against Character Precincts, Heritage Areas, Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct or Character Precinct-extension areas proposed by the Mt Victoria Historical Society.  Allowing buildings of such heights with a 5 metre height to boundary will destroy the heritage or character from a visual point of view and reduce the well-being of residents due to insufficient light and sunshine. This will likely to lead to degradation and abandonment of these properties.	Seeks that a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zoned land at least one property wide is required between any Character Precinct or Heritage Area border and the High Density Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.171	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers it is important for heritage buildings and areas and character precincts not to be overshadowed by bulk or form of an adjacent tall buildings. Considers it is a well settled principle that heritage buildings ought to have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building whilst also providing for development that is not inappropriate in terms of section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.81	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that it is important for heritage buildings/areas not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent tall buildings. Considers that it is a settled legal principle that heritage buildings have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building while otherwise providing for appropriate development.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Prime Property Group	256.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Opposes the 'Spenmoor Street Area' mapping layer related to policy the submitter seeks deletion of.	Delete the 'Spenmoor Street Area' from the planning maps.	Accept.	Yes.
Onslow Residents Community Association	283.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Khandallah is a small neighbourhood village that only supports its local community. The adjacent centres of Ngaio-Crofton Downs and Johnsonville have all the services Khandallah has, and also contain larger facilities, so do not require such support. The current supermarket and retail shops, plus services including medical, education, recreation, etc. are all small and are at capacity right now. The road the retail centre is on is a constrained one-lane road.  They therefore will not support the increased demand coming from the significant medium density development proposed by 14m zones.  Considers that the three waters infrastructure in Khandallah will not support intensification.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend the mapping in Khandallah to remove 14m building heights in the Medium Density Residential Zone and replace them with 11m building heights.	Reject.	No.
Johanna Carter	296.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Opposes the MRZ objectives, policies and standards	Opposes Medium Density Residential zone chapter as mapped.	Reject.	No.
Johanna Carter	296.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	[No specific reason given for decision requested - see original submission for further reason]	Seeks that the extent of the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) is amended to better reflect the conditions of the particular areas of the city, including the following factors:  - water supply - wastewater - drainage services	Reject.	No.
Khoi Phan	326.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers Ngaio should be classified as Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain Ngaio as Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept.	No.
Khoi Phan	326.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers Khandallah should be classified as Medium Density Residential Zone.	Retain Khandallah as Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Richard Bengé	327.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Supports the rezoning of 33 Hiropi Street from Medium Density Residential Zone to High Density Residential Zone. This new zone is requested for the following reasons: Those included in the NPS-UD which allows for at least a 6-storey maximum height for medium density housing (high density housing according to the WCC PDP) within a walkable distance of the edge of the city centre and metropolitan centre zones, as well as existing and planned rapid transit stops. The existing environment already allows for high density residential developments given existing precedents at 109 and 111 Coromandel Street and 46 Hiropi Street that fall in the 21 m maximum height zone. Rezoning 33 Hiropi Street and neighbouring sites will turn existing developments into “compliant” developments with the maximum height regulations included in the PDP. The planned LGWM mass transit route between Wellington Railway Station and Island Bay from will provide potential for new housing and neighbourhood growth, as all mass transit options put forward by LGWM included a route through Riddiford St. Finally, a co-housing approach will reinforce the city’s distinctive compact form, capitalise on lower levels of natural hazard risk in this area, increase the vibrancy of inner city living and support Wellington becoming a Zero Carbon Capital by reducing private vehicle reliance. Additionally, bringing 33 Hiropi St into the HRZ will provide an increase in accessible units at a time of housing need. (Option A)  [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that a High Density Residential Zone be introduced on Hiropi Street that includes 33 Hiropi Street..	Reject.	No.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	F582.114	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers the submission point is more enabling of intensification than the NPS-UD and MDRS and is not justified.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Richard Bengé	327.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Hiropi Street should have an HRZ that includes 33 Hiropi Street. The MRZ height control area 2 (14m) at 33 Hiropi Street is too restrictive. This rezoning is requested for the following reasons: Those included in the NPS-UD which allows for at least a 6-storey maximum height for medium density housing (high density housing according to the WCC PDP) within a walkable distance of the edge of the city centre and metropolitan centre zones, as well as existing and planned rapid transit stops. The existing environment already allows for high density residential developments given existing precedents at 109 and 111 Coromandel Street and 46 Hiropi Street that fall in the 21 m maximum height zone. Rezoning 33 Hiropi Street and neighbouring sites will turn existing developments into “compliant” developments with the maximum height regulations included in the PDP. The planned LGWM mass transit route between Wellington Railway Station and Island Bay from will provide potential for new housing and neighbourhood growth, as all mass transit options put forward by LGWM included a route through Riddiford St. Finally, a co-housing approach will reinforce the city’s distinctive compact form, capitalise on lower levels of natural hazard risk in this area, increase the vibrancy of inner city living and support Wellington becoming a Zero Carbon Capital by reducing private vehicle reliance. Additionally, bringing 33 Hiropi St into the HRZ will provide an increase in accessible units at a time of housing need. (Option B)  [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Rezone 33 Hiropi Street from Medium Density Residential Zone to High Density Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents’ Association	333.7	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that adjacent property owners, particularly of wooden structures, should be enabled to gain access for repairs and maintenance to their structures, and to maintain access to services/utilities and boundary fences. It references standard HRZ - S3 and states that “amend if necessary”. 1.5m front yard setback and a 1 metre yard are considered absolute minimums (perhaps should be more).	Seeks that there are adequate setbacks for buildings and structures from neighbouring boundaries in any residential zone. 1.5m front yard setback and a 1 metre yard are considered absolute minimums (perhaps should be more).	Accept in part.	No.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.14	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that in addition to retaining Strathmore Park properties as Medium Density Residential Zone, that a precinct with associated objectives, policies, rules and standards is applied across Strathmore Park that seeks to enabling Taranaki Whānui to exercise their customary responsibilities as kaitiaki, and to undertake development that supports their cultural, social and economic wellbeing.	Reject.	No.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.15	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks that in addition to retaining Strathmore Park properties as Medium Density Residential Zone and establishing a precinct, that any other such amendments that are most appropriate to address their submission.	Reject.	No.
Newtown Residents’ Association	440.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 14m height are unnecessary in Newtown and should be reduced to 11m.	Seeks that Newtown be classified as MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control) - Height Area 1 (11m).	Accept in part.	Yes.
Newtown Residents’ Association	440.5	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 14m height are unnecessary in Berhampore and should be reduced to 11m.	Seeks that Berhampore be classified as MRZ-S2 (Building Height Control) - Height Area 1 (11m).	Accept in part	Yes

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Catharine Underwood	481.14	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the MRZ for Brooklyn should be removed and the status quo remains until a proper character/heritage assessment has been completed for the Brooklyn Area. Allowing 11 and 14 metres in height is likely to undermine potential character areas could create towering buildings dominating the neighbourhood.	Seeks that Brooklyn not be zoned Medium Density Residential.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.293	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Catharine Underwood	481.15	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the height limits in the central Brooklyn Zone be limited to 14m on the south side and 11m on the north side. Any higher than this will impact on sunlight onto the street, create a canyon effect for what is a narrow street and cause much shading on the street.	Seeks that Height Controls in the Local Centre Zone of Brooklyn be reduced to 14m on the south side and 11m on the north side.	Addressed in Report 4C.	
Catharine Underwood	481.16	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the north side of Upland Road in the Kelburn Village zone should be limited to 11m in height and the south side be limited to 14m. 22m height is way out of proportion to the available area, will destroy to street scape, will reduce sunlight on the south side of the street. And not provide a "transition" between the centre and the houses.	Seeks that the North side of Upland Road in Kelburn Village be limited to 11m in height and the south side be limited to 14m.	Addressed in Report 4C	
Rod Halliday	25.15	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that Lot 5 (DP524106) at 35 Bickerton Rise has recently transferred to WCC as reserve.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Rezone part of the overlay at 35 Bickerton Rise from 'Medium Density Residential Zone' to 'Natural Open Space Zone' [As illustrated in the submission]	Accept.	Yes.
Vik Holdings Ltd	31.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that 15 Brougham Street should be rezoned from MRZ to HRZ.  15 Brougham Street is a multi flat dwelling associated with the adjoining owners of 13 and 11 Brougham Street which are classified as HRZ. Together these three sites are approximately 2283m2 and would be suitable for total redevelopment.  Under the Draft District Plan, 15 Brougham Street was classified as HDRZ.  This property is set back 50 metres from the road and is not visible from Brougham Street. Any redevelopment would have no or minimal impact on the streetscape.	Rezone 15 Brougham Street from Medium Density Residential Zone to High Density Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.
Mt Victoria Historical Society Inc	FS39.22	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Submitter 31 seeks to rezone 15 Brougham Street as High Density Residential Zone. Further submitter oppose this because it is an enclave of very historic, including 1 architecturally very significant, homes. It also abuts Claremont Grove, which we have proposed as a Heritage Area, and was originally considered part of it. (Ref our submission on the Proposed District Plan, where we submit that it should be part of the Claremont Grove Heritage Area.)	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.115	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Considers the submission point is more enabling of intensification than the NPS-UD and MDRS and is not justified.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
292 Main Road Limited	105.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes 292 Main Road, Tawa being zoned as MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) and seeks that it is rezoned as a HRZ (High Density Residential Zone).  The site is within 700m walking distance from Lindon Station in Tawa which is a rapid transit stop and is therefore within a walkable catchment.  WCC Spatial Plan puts the site within NPS-UD Policy 3 (c) areas.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Rezone 292 Main Road, Tawa from MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) to HRZ (High Density Residential Zone).	Reject.	No.
Tawa Business Group	107.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that 1 Redwood Avenue, Tawa should be rezoned to Mixed Use Zone.  This site is currently used alongside 3 Redwood Avenue and 85 Main Road, Tawa for the purposes of the BestStart Tawa preschool and day-care centre. Rezoning to Mixed Use would acknowledge the current established activity taking place on site, and allow for future educational facilities to be subject to MUZ permitted activity standards.  Rezoning 1 Redwood Avenue would match the MUZ of the property at 89 Main Road, and, being situated on a corner site, would not result in an inconsistent pattern of development.  [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Rezone 1 Redwood Avenue, Tawa from Medium Density Residential Zone to Mixed Use Zone.	Reject.	No.



Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Tawa Business Group	107.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 3 Redwood Avenue, Tawa should be rezoned to Mixed Use Zone.</p> <p>This site is currently used alongside 1 Redwood Avenue and 85 Main Road, Tawa for the purposes of the BestStart Tawa preschool and daycare centre. Rezoning to Mixed Use would acknowledge the current established activity taking place on site, and allow for future educational facilities to be subject to MUZ permitted activity standards.</p> <p>Rezoning 1 Redwood Avenue would match the MUZ of the property at 89 Main Road, and, being situated on a corner site, would not result in an inconsistent pattern of development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Rezone 3 Redwood Avenue, Tawa from Medium Density Residential Zone to Mixed Use Zone.	Reject.	No.
Tawa Business Group	107.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that 85 Main Road, Tawa should be rezoned to Mixed Use Zone.</p> <p>This site is currently used alongside 1 Redwood Avenue and 3 Redwood Avenue, Tawa for the purposes of the BestStart Tawa preschool and day-care centre. Rezoning to Mixed Use would acknowledge the current established activity taking place on site, and allow for future educational facilities to be subject to MUZ permitted activity standards.</p> <p>Rezoning 1 Redwood Avenue would match the MUZ of the property at 89 Main Road, and, being situated on a corner site, would not result in an inconsistent pattern of development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Rezone 85 Main Road, Tawa from Medium Density Residential Zone to Mixed Use Zone.	Reject.	No.
Ciampa Family Trust	165.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that the northern part of the site at 50 Cleveland Street, Brooklyn should be rezoned as LCZ so that the site does not have split zoning and the northern part could be developed for non-residential purposes as a permitted activity.</p> <p>Considers that this is logical as it will enable greater intensification of a finite resource (land) on a site that is favourably located in close proximity to amenities, public transport routes, and the CBD.</p>	Rezone the northern part of the site at 50 Cleveland Street, Brooklyn from Medium Density Residential Zone to Local Centre Zone.	Reject.	No.
Historic Places Wellington	182.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers the Inner Residential suburbs should be zoned Medium Density Residential Zone. This means that all areas of character protection under the operative DP would have similar rules and height controls of 11metres (3 storey).</p>	Rezone the Inner Residential Suburbs to the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.101	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>All inner Residential suburbs should be MDZ</p> <p>Exemption from upzoning</p> <p>Importance of character areas</p> <p>Character Precincts, rules &amp; design regime</p> <p>Extended Character Precincts in line with Boffa Miskell</p> <p>Demolition be a restricted activity for pre-1930 buildings</p> <p>New viewshaft for views of St Paul's</p>	Allow	Accept in part.	Yes.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	F589.76	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>Kāinga Ora is concerned about the potential loss in intensification opportunities if the proposed relief is granted.</p>	Disallow	Accept in part.	Yes
Jonothan and Tricia Briscoe	190.6	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that there is inadequate protection provided where 28.5m high buildings are permitted up against Character Precincts, Heritage Areas, Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct or Character Precinct-extension areas proposed by the Mt Victoria Historical Society.</p> <p>Allowing buildings of such heights with a 5 metre height to boundary will destroy the heritage or character from a visual point of view and reduce the well-being of residents due to insufficient light and sunshine. This will likely to lead to degradation and abandonment of these properties.</p>	Amend the mapping to require a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zoned land at least one property wide between any Character Precinct or Heritage Area border and the City Centre Zone.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.172	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>Considers it is important for heritage buildings and areas and character precincts not to be overshadowed by bulk or form of an adjacent tall buildings. Considers it is a well settled principle that heritage buildings ought to have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building whilst also providing for development that is not inappropriate in terms of section 6(f) of the RMA.</p>	Allow	Reject.	No.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	F511.82	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	<p>Considers that it is important for heritage buildings/areas not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent tall buildings. Considers that it is a settled legal principle that heritage buildings have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building while otherwise providing for appropriate development.</p>	Allow	Reject.	No.
Jonothan and Tricia Briscoe	190.7	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that an area of specific concern where afternoon sun can be blocked by 28.5m buildings is the Moir Street Heritage Area.</p>	Amend the heights on the mapping to provide a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone at least one property wide between any Character Precinct or Heritage Area border and a High Density Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.173	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers it is important for heritage buildings and areas and character precincts not to be overshadowed by bulk or form of an adjacent tall buildings. Considers it is a well settled principle that heritage buildings ought to have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building whilst also providing for development that is not inappropriate in terms of section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.83	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that it is important for heritage buildings/areas not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent tall buildings. Considers that it is a settled legal principle that heritage buildings have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building while otherwise providing for appropriate development.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.8	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that an area of specific concern where afternoon sun can be blocked by 21m buildings (in Brougham, Roxburgh and Austin Streets, and Claremont Grove) is the current Elizabeth/Queen St and Pat Lawlor Close, Caroline Street and Scarborough Terrace Character Precincts.	Amend the heights on the mapping to provide a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone at least one property wide between any Character Precinct or Heritage Area border and a High Density Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.174	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers it is important for heritage buildings and areas and character precincts not to be overshadowed by bulk or form of an adjacent tall buildings. Considers it is a well settled principle that heritage buildings ought to have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building whilst also providing for development that is not inappropriate in terms of section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.84	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that it is important for heritage buildings/areas not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent tall buildings. Considers that it is a settled legal principle that heritage buildings have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building while otherwise providing for appropriate development.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.9	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that an area of specific concern where afternoon sun can be blocked by 21m buildings (in Tutchen Avenue) is part of the Porritt Avenue Heritage Area.	Amend the heights on the mapping to provide a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone at least one property wide between any Character Precinct or Heritage Area border and a High Density Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.175	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers it is important for heritage buildings and areas and character precincts not to be overshadowed by bulk or form of an adjacent tall buildings. Considers it is a well settled principle that heritage buildings ought to have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building whilst also providing for development that is not inappropriate in terms of section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.85	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that it is important for heritage buildings/areas not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent tall buildings. Considers that it is a settled legal principle that heritage buildings have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building while otherwise providing for appropriate development.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.10	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that an area of specific concern where afternoon sun can be blocked by 28.5m buildings is the east side of Lipman Street.	Amend the heights on the mapping to provide a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone at least one property wide between any Character Precinct or Heritage Area border and a High Density Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.176	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers it is important for heritage buildings and areas and character precincts not to be overshadowed by bulk or form of an adjacent tall buildings. Considers it is a well settled principle that heritage buildings ought to have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building whilst also providing for development that is not inappropriate in terms of section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.86	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that it is important for heritage buildings/areas not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent tall buildings. Considers that it is a settled legal principle that heritage buildings have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building while otherwise providing for appropriate development.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that allowing buildings of heights of 21m or 28.5m with 5 metre boundaries will destroy heritage or character from a visual point of view and lead to degradation of such properties.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that a 'transition zone' of Medium Density Residential Zone of at least one property wide be required between any Character Precinct or heritage area border and a High Density Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.31	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	It is important for heritage buildings/areas not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent buildings.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.170	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers it is important for heritage buildings and areas and character precincts not to be overshadowed by bulk or form of an adjacent tall buildings. Considers it is a well settled principle that heritage buildings ought to have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building whilst also providing for development that is not inappropriate in terms of section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.95	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and its impacts on the supply of a variety of housing choices and typologies in Wellington.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.66	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	No specific reason provided.	Allow	Reject.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.79	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that it is important for heritage buildings/areas not to be overshadowed in bulk and form by adjacent tall buildings. Considers that it is a settled legal principle that heritage buildings have a curtilage around them to protect public views of the heritage building while otherwise providing for appropriate development.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Adam King	246.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose in part	Opposes the zoning of 12a Parliament Street as Medium Density Residential.	Retain as notified with amendment below.	Reject.	No.
Prime Property Group	256.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the development area identified at 14 Epic Way to be an appropriate site for rezoning to Medium density residential, including because the site has services, has been designed to avoid impact on SNAs and would be in keeping with the area around [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks to rezone the development area within S17-1095-PDP1 (14 Epic Way) to Medium Density Residential.  [See original submission for attachment]	Addressed in Hearing Stream 7.	
Wellington International Airport Limited	FS36.243	General / Mapping / General	Oppose	WIAL opposes this submission to the extent that the rezoning could further exacerbate protrusions into the obstacle limitation surface due to the current 11m height limit specified in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Disallow	Addressed in Hearing Stream 7.	
Heidi Snelson, Aman Hunt, Chia Hunt, Ela Hunt	276.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) within the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West development should be zoned LLRZ (Large Lot Residential Zone).  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Rezone Medium Density Residential Zone land at 395 Middleton Road in the Upper Stebbings and Glenside West Future Development Zone to Large Lot Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.7	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that if agreement cannot be reached with Council on appropriate tenure for the land currently identified as MRZ, seeks that Large Lot Residential for the remaining land and a portion of land comprising some 5,500m <sup>2</sup> next to Silverstream Road as Medium Density Residential Zone.  Considers request of alternative approach is to the balance land is because it is not appropriate to zone private land for what is considered essentially a public work (Reserve).	Seeks that if agreement cannot be reached with Council on appropriate tenure for the land currently identified as Medium Density Residential Zone, then the submitter seeks Large Lot Residential for the remaining land and a portion of land comprising some 5,500m <sup>2</sup> next to Silverstream Road as Medium Density Residential Zone.	Addressed in Hearing Stream 7.	
Adam Groenewegen	FS46.25	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to, in the alternative to WCC agreeing appropriate tenure issues over the SW NOSZ land, to rezone it Large Lot residential or part (5500m <sup>2</sup> ) as MDRZ. These proposals fly in the face of the incredibly high natural values of this land and seem a poorly thought through route to force the hand of WCC to complete reserve purchase or contribution negotiations. The suggested MDRZ area of 5500m <sup>2</sup> is on an incredibly steep south facing cross slopes with a narrow road frontage (5m) and difficult access over an old stream bed. Vegetation in this area also has high biodiversity values. Development here sandwiched in between high biodiversity WCC reserve land would be inappropriate.	Disallow	Addressed in Hearing Stream 7.	
Jo McKenzie	FS64.25	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to, in the alternative to WCC agreeing appropriate tenure issues over the SW NOSZ land, to rezone it Large Lot residential or part (5500m <sup>2</sup> ) as MDRZ. Considers that these proposals fly in the face of the incredibly high natural values of this land and seem a poorly thought through route to force the hand of WCC to complete reserve purchase or contribution negotiations. The suggested MDRZ area of 5500m <sup>2</sup> is on an incredibly steep south facing cross slopes with a narrow road frontage (5m) and difficult access over an old stream bed. Vegetation in this area also has high biodiversity values. Considers that development here sandwiched in between high biodiversity WCC reserve land would be inappropriate.	Disallow	Addressed in Hearing Stream 7.	
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.17	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Forest & Bird strongly opposes alternative zoning of land adjoining Silverstream Road to enable the submitter's Kilmarston subdivision. The land adjoining Silverstream Road is a high-quality SNA (WC060) with some of the best primary forest remnants left within the city limits. Large Lot Residential zoning and a small area of Medium Density Residential or equivalent zoning adjoining Silverstream Road would be contrary to the ECO provisions of the plan and not give effect to policies 23 & 24 of the RPS or s6 of the RMA.	Disallow	Addressed in Hearing Stream 7.	
Andy Foster	FS86.45	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that it is not reasonable to allow for housing development to intrude into the land zoned Open Space and Rural in the Operative Plan. The landscape impacts would be substantial, both of any housing and of the roading access. The impacts on vegetation would also be significant. Notes that the area of bush at the bottom of the site, immediately adjacent to and climbing up from Silverstream Road is of particularly high quality. The concept of putting housing or an access road through it would be entirely unreasonable. For all these reasons Andy Foster opposes any development in this area beyond a carefully designed reservoir.  [See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.7]	Disallow	Addressed in Hearing Stream 7.	

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Andy Foster	FS86.60	Part 3 / Open Space and Recreation Zones / Open Space Zone / General OSZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that it is reasonable to allow for housing development to intrude into the land zoned Open Space and Rural in the Operative Plan. The landscape impacts would be substantial, both of any housing and of the roading access. The impacts on vegetation would also be significant. Notes that the area of bush at the bottom of the site, immediately adjacent to and climbing up from Silverstream Road is of particularly high quality. The concept of putting housing or an access road through it would be entirely unreasonable. For all these reasons Andy Foster opposes any development in this area beyond a carefully designed reservoir.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for full reasoning]. [Inferred reference to submission 290.70]</p>	Disallow	Addressed in Hearing Stream 7.	
Parsons Green Trust	291.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that The current and ongoing childcare centre use of the PGT land would better align with the purpose of the MUZ, and the MUZ provisions would better enable commercial and mixed use development opportunities to service the surrounding residential catchment,</p> <p>A MUZ and MDRZ zone interface is not out of the ordinary. The PGT land is similarly located on the corner of Redwood Avenue / Main Road and adjoins the General Industrial Zone to the east. Furthermore, in order to address the interface with residential zones The MUZ contains rules relating to buildings and standards, noting that Rule MUZ-S5 requires windows on walls adjacent to Residential Zones to comprise of opaque privacy glazing to mitigate privacy or overlooking onto adjoining residentially zoned sites.</p> <p>MUZ is the most appropriate zoning for the PGT land. Applying the MUZ to the PGT land would create a practical zoning boundary and the MUZ contains provisions which manage potential privacy and amenity effects on adjoining MDRZ sites.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Rezone 1 & 3 Redwood Avenue and 85 Main Road, Tawa from Medium Density Residential Zone to Mixed Use Zone.	Reject.	No.
Tapu-te-Ranga Trust	297.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Submitter would like to amend the extent of residential zoning within the PDP to reflect the existing split of residential and open space zoning of 44 Rhine Street in the operative district plan.</p> <p>This is to reflect the aspirations the submitter has for the site in the next 10-15 years. At this stage, the Trust do not have the resources to comprehensively address contamination and geotechnical issues, so would like to revert to the zoning shown in the operative district plan (changing additional Medium Residential Zone back to Open Space).</p>	Seeks that land at 44 Rhine Street, Island Bay that has been rezoned Medium Density Residential Zone from Natural Open Space Zone, be rezoned back to Natural Open Space Zone in the mapping.	Reject.	No.
Paul Blaschke	FS129.2	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Supports submission points relating to land that has been rezoned Medium Density Residential Zone from Natural Open Space Zone, be rezoned back to Natural Open Space Zone in the mapping. This position reflects the historical understanding reached between the Trust and the Manawa Karioi Society, which retains and protects the Open Space reserve nature of the bush areas, at the same time as identifying land within the 44 Rhine Street lot that could be developed to support the aspirations of the Trust and of the wider Maori and city populations.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.29	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Seeks that the Kilbirnie Bus Barns are re-zoned from Medium Density Residential Zone to the High Density Residential Zone.	Seeks that the Kilbirnie Bus Barns are re-zoned from Medium Density Residential Zone to the High Density Residential Zone.	Accept in part.	No.
Bus Barn Ltd	FS95.5	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Kāinga Ora seeks to rezone the development from MDRZ to HDRZ. Bus Barn Limited supports this proposal as it will align with the increase in height control and allow for a more permissive development.	Allow / Rezone Bus Barn from MRZ to HRZ	Accept in part.	No.
Investore Property Limited	405.14	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that the current zoning disregards the NPS-UD direction. The Johnsonville Line should be classified as rapid transit and as such it should apply full NPS-UD zoning (six-storey).</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Rezone the Johnsonville line from MRZ to HRZ and provide building heights of at least six storeys within a 10-minute walkable catchment of the stations on the Johnsonville Rail Line. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.6	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers improvements to the Johnsonville line may only be taken into account if they are "planned" in a Regional Land Transport Plan (RLTP). Considers there are no such improvements for the Johnsonville line planned in the RLTP. Considers the definition of "planned" in the NPS-UD resolves any circularity in the Johnsonville line not being a rapid transit service. Considers improvements to a transit service must be planned in the RLTP before they are relevant to any upzoning under the NPS-UD. [Refer to original submission - 233]	Disallow	Accept	No

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington City Council Environmental Reference Group	FS112.18	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Agree that the current zoning disregards the NPS-UD direction. The Johnsonville Line should be classified as rapid transit and as such it should apply full NPS-UD zoning.	Allow	Reject.	No
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.9	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) requires district plans to enable building heights of at least 6 storeys within at least a walkable catchment of the edge of metropolitan centre zones (Policy 3(c)).	Seeks that the areas surrounding the Kilbirnie Metropolitan Centre Zone be rezoned as High Density Residential Zone (in a similar way to the inclusion of areas surrounding the Johnsonville Metropolitan Centre Zone and within Newtown).	Accept	Yes
Greater Brooklyn Residents Association Inc's	459.6	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that any medium density housing for Brooklyn not be implemented until a proper character/heritage assessment has been completed.  Considers that without character assessment, large 22m buildings will create small, disconnected blocks easily compromised or destroyed by high density development adjacent.  [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Retain the Operative District Plan Zoning for the Brooklyn suburb.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.294	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers the Boffa Miskell report, Council officers' assessment, and other evidence, justifies extending the character protections and rezoning for all areas identified by submitters in the rest the further submitter's table [see further submission for full information]. Considers that these proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.80	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes the Residential Zoning of 3 Dekka Street.  Considers that 3 Dekka Street and 31-33 Nicholson Road should be rezoned as LCZ as these three properties are all owned by FSNI and a resource consent application is currently being considered by Council (Ref. SR 517439) to extend the supermarket activity.	Rezone 3 Dekka Street from Medium Density Residential Zone to Local Centre Zone	Addressed in Report 4C	
Judith Ridley-Smith	FS47.1	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Foodstuffs's North Island, who have a wish to redevelop 3 Dekka St to an at grade level carpark (do not broadly object to - subject to some mitigation effects). Foodstuffs North Island should proceed with a planning application to get this at grade carpark consented within the existing planning framework. Khandallah Village is a "village" and the zoning change sought by Foodstuffs North Island would allow development inconsistent with that village atmosphere. 6 levels on the site would be detrimental to the further submitter, as a neighbour.  [Inferred reference to submission 476.80]	Disallow / No zoning change should be made in respect of 3 Dekka St.	Addressed in Report 4C	
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.5	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Opposes Local Centre Zoning of 3 Dekka Street.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 4C	
Rebecca Morder	FS90.1	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Oppose 476.81 seeking to rezone 3 Dekka St to the Local Centre Zone. Considers that it is more appropriate that they seek resource consent for their plans than to rezone the site. Also, Khandallah Village is a small village and it is not suitable to be classified as a "local centre" like Newtown or Karori. It is a "neighbourhood centre" like Nagios.  [Inferred reference to submission 476.80]	Disallow	Addressed in Report 4C	
Foodstuffs North Island	476.81	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes the Residential Zoning of 31-33 Nicholson Road.  Considers that 3 Dekka Street and 31-33 Nicholson Road should be rezoned as LCZ as these three properties are all owned by FSNI and a resource consent application is currently being considered by Council (Ref. SR 517439) to extend the supermarket activity.	Rezone 31-33 Nicholson Road from Medium Density Residential Zone to Local Centre Zone.	Addressed in Report 4C	
Onslow Residents Community Association	FS80.6	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Opposes Local Centre Zoning of 31-33 Nicholson Road.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 4C	
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.149	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that it is inappropriate to rezone in anticipation of a resource consent being granted.	Disallow	Addressed in Report 4C	
Gareth Morgan	18.1	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Hay Street is a river gully and building further resilient drainage is difficult.  Hay Street has poor vehicle access.  Increasing height limits on Hay Street would negatively impact the character of the area and the streetscape.	Retain MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) as notified - with 11m height limit. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.82	Part 1 / National Direction Instruments Subpart / National Direction Instruments / National Policy Statements and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Oppose	The submitters reasons are not justifiable as the unstable geography is determined by a geotechnical analysis of a s88 RMA Report. This would ensure that any future development would not be adversely impacted by unstable geography. The road navigation and suitability for turning bays are addressed through a Traffic Assessment as part of a s88 RMA Report. An increase in density on Hay Street would not adversely effect road navigation and vehicular access. Lastly, Wellington City Council has determined the Heritage Precincts with regards to Qualifying Matters. As noted in the Proposed District Plan s32 Evaluation report Part 2: Character Precincts and the Mt Victoria North Townscape Precinct at s6, there exists a process for determining character precincts relative to a series of key criteria. Oriental Bay & Hay Street are not recognised as having a Character Area Qualifying Matter apply. MRZ-PREC03 (Oriental Bay Height Precinct) is an appropriate precinct for recognising the aspects that have been tested before the courts. Any expansion to this precinct fails to give effect to Policy 3 of the NPS-UD.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Joanne Morgan	19.1	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Hay Street is steep and narrow, and has unstable topography with lots of ground water ingress. It is hazardous for emergency vehicles to access. Allowing high rise construction would exacerbate this issue.	Retain MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) as notified - with 11m height limit. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept.	No.
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.46	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Oppose	Opposes the original submission to keep hay Street as a MDZ and retain 10-minute walking catchment. The submitters reasonings do not align with data showing that walking/cycling is a favoured commute options.  [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Emma Baines	185.3	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the PDP heights for Cockayne Road, Khandallah.	Retain proposed building heights for Cockayne Road as notified.	Reject	No.
Peter Nunns	196.4	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the extension of medium density residential zone to Berhampore, including the Chatham Street neighbourhood.	Retain Medium Density Residential Zone mapping in Berhampore as notified.	Accept.	No.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.17	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the upzoning of residential land to medium-density, in keeping with the MDRS.  Considers that this will allow more housing across current suburbs, providing more choice for young people of where to live in the future and reducing reliance on new greenfield developments.	Retain spatial extent of the MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.1	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports and requests that the height limits as proposed to apply the properties on the southern side of Sunrise Boulevard, Tawa (which is adjacent to the northern boundary of the Arohata Prison site, as shown in the excerpt below from the PDP zone maps), are retained.  These include the following proposed height limits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium Density Residential Zone = 11m (see in yellow in excerpt below)</li> <li>• High Density Residential Zone = 21m (see in orange in excerpt below)</li> </ul> Ara Poutama would be opposed to any increase/s in height along that boundary, beyond that currently proposed. It is imperative that proposed height increases do not create the opportunity for a breach in security, for example enabling contraband to be thrown over fences into the Arohata Prison facility. It is also important that the operational facility is not subject to reverse sensitivity issues, such as privacy and amenity of adjacent multi-level residential developments that could see into the prison.	Retain the 11m height limit proposed to apply to the properties on the southern side of Sunrise Boulevard, Tawa.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.2	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 240.1 in that it is inconsistent with the Kāinga Ora submission whereby Kāinga Ora have sought for an expansion of the HDRZ along the southern side of Sunrise Boulevard.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.2	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports and requests that the height limits as proposed to apply the properties on the southern side of Sunrise Boulevard, Tawa (which is adjacent to the northern boundary of the Arohata Prison site, as shown in the excerpt below from the PDP zone maps), are retained.  These include the following proposed height limits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium Density Residential Zone = 11m (see in yellow in excerpt below)</li> <li>• High Density Residential Zone = 21m (see in orange in excerpt below)</li> </ul> Ara Poutama would be opposed to any increase/s in height along that boundary, beyond that currently proposed. It is imperative that proposed height increases do not create the opportunity for a breach in security, for example enabling contraband to be thrown over fences into the Arohata Prison facility. It is also important that the operational facility is not subject to reverse sensitivity issues, such as privacy and amenity of adjacent multi-level residential developments that could see into the prison.	Retain the 21m height limit proposed to apply to the properties on the southern side of Sunrise Boulevard, Tawa.	Accept.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.3	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes submission point 240.2 in that it is inconsistent with the Kāinga Ora submission whereby Kāinga Ora have sought for an expansion of the HDRZ along the southern side of Sunrise Boulevard.  [Inferred reference to submission 240.3]	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.8	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the Medium Density Residential zoning of the residential part of the site.	Retain Medium Density Residential Zone as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.18	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Oppose	Forest & Bird is concerned at the level of vegetation clearance to enable development of the land currently proposed MRZ. MRZ would be incompatible with s31(1)(b)(iii) of the RMA and the requirements to maintain indigenous biodiversity. Suggest GRZ is more appropriate for the capacity of the land and its biodiversity values.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.11	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Seeks that the planning maps retain the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) areas of the subject land.	Retain the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) areas of the site in the mapping, as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS85.21	General / Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Oppose	Forest & Bird is concerned at the level of vegetation clearance to enable development of the land currently proposed MRZ. MRZ would be incompatible with s31(1)(b)(iii) of the RMA and the requirements to maintain indigenous biodiversity. Suggest GRZ is more appropriate for the capacity of the land and its biodiversity values.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	346.2	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Supports the Medium Density Residential Zone classification of Ryman Healthcare Limited's site in Karori.	Accept.	No.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.22	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the proposed Medium Density Residential zone proposed for Right of Refusal properties in Strathmore Park.	Retain zoning for Right of Refusal properties in Strathmore Park, as notified.	Accept.	No.
Enterprise Miramar Peninsula Inc	FS26.17	General / Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Support	EMPI supports medium density residential and mixed-use development for Strathmore Park.  The review of the Spatial Plan clearly relates to the subsequent Opportunity Area – “Strathmore Park”, this being a medium density residential and mixed-use development making efficient use of existing infrastructure, community facilities and transport links. EMPI supports medium density residential in Strathmore Park.  [Inferred reference to submission 389.22]	Allow	Accept.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the maximum height in the residential area of Khandallah should be 11m	Amend the height in the mapping to 11m in Khandallah.	Reject.	No.
Elayna Chhiba	FS131.3	General / Other / Other / Other	Support	Supports increasing walking catchments around the City Centre Zone for the following reasons: - Benefits to housing supply, affordable housing, and the climate. - Larger walking catchments will make it easier for younger people to rent and buy housing. - A larger walking catchment will mean people will have greater opportunities to live, work, and play in their city centres. - Social equity increases when density increases; higher density housing can offer a greater variety of housing options, making housing more affordable. - A larger walking catchment will enable people to live closer to the City Centre which will reduce reliance on private vehicle use which will reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, less reliance on private vehicles increases overall health. - Higher density housing will support providing liveable cities for future Wellingtonians. The NPS-UD and the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act provides for greater density.  [See original Further Submission for full reasoning].	Allow	Reject.	No.
Kilmarston Developments Limited and Kilmarston Properties Limited	290.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support in part	Supports (in general) the Proposed District Plan as it provides for an appropriate residential and open space outcome for the land owned by the submitter - being 16 Patna Street, 109A Awarua Street and 76 Silverstream Road, Ngaio.	Not specified.	Accept.	No.
Grant Henderson	FS55.1	General / Whole PDP / Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	Provide housing and open space is needed.  [Inferred reference to submission 290.1]	Not specified.	Accept.	No.

Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Adam King	246.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Seeks to add retain Operative District Plan zoning of the Inner Residential Zone for 12a Parliament Street.	Reject.	No.
Phillippa O'Connor	289.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the Western Side of Kelburn Parade, especially #64 Kelburn Parade should be rezoned to HR2 because:  - It is close to the transport network, employment opportunities and social infrastructure. - Larger building heights would support additional housing for the benefit of those utilising the university.  [See original submission for full details]	Seeks that the western side of Kelburn Parade is rezoned to the High Density Residential Zone with a maximum building height of 21m.	Reject.	No.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.5	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Greater intensification on Oriental Parade and in Hay and Grass Streets is opposed. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responded to the judgment in the submitter's successful legal case D Rendel, A Mallinson & others v Wellington City Council Decision No. W73/98 and provides protection for significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character in Oriental Bay. Refer to original submission 81 (points 81.3 and 81.4).	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Denis Foot	FS10.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	The matters of the heights density and planning issues in Oriental Bay were the subject of a very expensive three week hearing at the Environment Court. The case was called Foot v WCC. In that case there were many lawyers, planners, urban designers, architects and residents that gave their views. Judge Kenderdine gave a very carefully considered judgement covering the various areas in Oriental Bay. The decision takes into account the diverse landforms which includes several valleys. There are still many areas in the Oriental Bay area where it is possible to build multi-storey apartments.  [Inferred reference to submission point 490.6]	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Oriental Bay Residents Association	FS13.5	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.  Qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA arising from the topography and specific characteristics of residential side streets, including Hay St and Grass St.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Ruapapa Limited	FS18.7	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay. The principles set out in the Environment Court decision in Foot v WCC should remain in place.  Qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA arising from the topography and specific characteristics of residential side streets, including Hay St and Grass St. These matters impact the health and safety of Oriental Bay residents.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Scott Galloway and Carolyn McLean	FS19.5	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	As stated in OBRA's original submission of 12 September 2022. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.  Qualifying matters exist under s.79L and s.79 of the RMA arising from the topography and specific characteristics of residential side streets, including Hay St and Grass St.  The futher submitter also also refer to and support the media statement of the Insurance Council of New Zealand Inc dated 23 November 2022.  [Refer to further submission for full reason]	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Pukepuke Pari Residents Incorporated	FS37.22	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA relating to the specific characteristics of Hay St. Submitters repeats comments made above in relation to Property Council re their opposition to extension of the walkable catchment.  Considers that a limit of 10 mins on the walkable catchment is appropriate for Wellington and what is realistic for people to walk given the unusually windy weather and steep topography of Wellington. People's propensity to walk diminishes with distance. Particularly relevant if the catchment was increased to 15 minutes and the last 5 minutes was up a steep hill (as would be the case for eg in Hay Street).	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Gareth and Joanne Morgan	FS38.14	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Oppose those parts of Jonathon Markwick's submission that seeks to amend, remove or rezone the Oriental Bay Height Precinct to High Density Residential Zone.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.



Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Jenny Gyles	FS53.5	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	<p>The Oriental Bay Height Precinct responds to the site by site analysis of the area conducted by WCC and is necessary to protect the significant amenity value, landscape, townscape and character of Oriental Bay.</p> <p>Considers that qualifying matters exist under s.79L and s.79 of the RMA arising from the topography and specific characteristics of residential side streets, including Hay St and Grass St.</p> <p>Jenny Gyles refers to and support the media statement of the Insurance Council of New Zealand Inc dated 23 November 2022.</p> <p>Considers that the difficulties in obtaining and/or paying for insurance in the future for intensive housing in high hazard zones (especially re earthquake and climate change) and the exposure to hazard of increased infrastructure will be a burden on property owners, taxpayers, ratepayers and residents for many decades to come.</p>	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Generation Zero	FS54.4	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Support and submit: Enable 6 stories in Grass and Hay St, Oriental Parade as within the walkable catchment of the City Centre.	Allow / Seeks the adoption of 6 storey zoning across Grass Street and Hay Street.	Accept in part.	No.
Helen Foot	FS62.5	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	The Oriental Bay Height Precinct is extremely important to maintain important townscape and landscape values, and protects public views of Mt Victoria/Matairangi and St Gerards heritage site, and also supports the unique character of Oriental Bay. The Oriental Bay Height Precinct and in particular that part of it adjacent to Hay Street and Grass Street was the subject of a very careful review in the decision of the Environment Court in 1989 (Helen Foot and others v WCC Decision W79/98). There is nothing to be gained by seeking a review of this decision.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Don MacKay	FS94.22	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that qualifying matters exist under s.77L and s.77R of the RMA relating to the specific characteristics of Wilkinson Street, particularly its steepness, narrowness, and potentially hazardous nature which make high density intensification inappropriate. Also Don MacKay repeat comments made above in relation to Property Council re their opposition to extension of the walkable catchment.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Victoria Stace	235.5	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the Hay Street Extension is not within a 10 minute walking Catchment from the City Centre.</p> <p>All of the properties along the extension have qualifying matters under P3.32 of the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The topography, safety issues, and impracticality make this area unsuitable for HRZ (High Density Residential Zone).</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>If the PDP is amended to extend walkable catchment beyond 10 minutes:</p> <p>Retain Hay Street Extension as notified (As Medium Density Residential Zone).</p>	Accept.	No
Escape Investments Limited	FS136.84	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Oppose	<p>Disagrees that changing the zoning of Hay Street to HRZ would result in unstable developments going ahead as a resource consent process will deal with this.</p> <p>[See original Further Submission for the full reasoning].</p>	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Coronation Real Estate Ltd	62.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that if the entire site at 9 Comber Place is not rezoned MRZ, then the zoning should be split with the northern portion being zoned MRZ and the southern portion zoned NOSZ as shown in the submission. (OPTION A)	<p>Seeks that if the entirety of the site at 9 Comber Place is not zoned Medium Density Residential Zone, then the zoning should be split Medium Density Residential Zone/Natural Open Space Zone with the zone boundary across the centre of the site.</p> <p>Consequential amendment to the mapping.</p>	Addressed in Stream 7	
Coronation Real Estate Ltd	62.4	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Amend	Considers that if the entire site at 9 Comber Place is not rezoned MRZ, then the existing split zoning should be retained. (OPTION B)	<p>Seeks that if the entirety of the site at 9 Comber Place is not zoned Medium Density Residential Zone and OPTION A is not selected, then the zoning should be split Medium Density Residential Zone/Natural Open Space Zone to reflect the Outer Residential/Open Space B zoning in the Operative District Plan.</p> <p>Consequential amendment to the mapping.</p>	Addressed in Stream 7	
292 Main Road Limited	105.3	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes 292 Main Road, Tawa (The site) being zoned as MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone).</p> <p>Considers that the site is within 700m walking distance from Lindon Station in Tawa which is a rapid transit stop and is therefore within a walkable catchment.</p> <p>WCC Spatial Plan puts the site within NPS-UD Policy 3 (c) areas.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons]</p>	Seeks that 292 Main Road, Tawa is rezoned to HRZ (High Density Residential Zone).	Reject.	No.
Tawa Business Group	107.16	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes the zoning of 1 Redwood Avenue, 3 Redwood Avenue, and 85 Main Road, Tawa as Medium Density Residential.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Rezone 1 Redwood Avenue, 3 Redwood Avenue, and 85 Main Road, Tawa from Medium Density Residential Zone to Mixed Use Zone.	Reject.	No.

## Medium Density Residential Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Parsons Green Trust	291.2	Residential Zones / Medium Density Residential Zone / General MRZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that The current and ongoing childcare centre use of the PGT land would better align with the purpose of the MUZ, and the MUZ provisions would better enable commercial and mixed use development opportunities to service the surrounding residential catchment,</p> <p>A MUZ and MDRZ zone interface is not out of the ordinary. The PGT land is similarly located on the corner of Redwood Avenue / Main Road and adjoins the General Industrial Zone to the east. Furthermore, in order to address the interface with residential zones The MUZ contains rules relating to buildings and standards, noting that Rule MUZ-S5 requires windows on walls adjacent to Residential Zones to comprise of opaque privacy glazing to mitigate privacy or overlooking onto adjoining residentially zoned sites.</p> <p>MUZ is the most appropriate zoning for the PGT land. Applying the MUZ to the PGT land would create a practical zoning boundary and the MUZ contains provisions which manage potential privacy and amenity effects on adjoining MDRZ sites.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Opposes 1 & 3 Redwood Avenue and 85 Main Road, Tawa being zoned as Medium Density Residential Zone.		
						Accept.	Yes
Kirsty Woods	437.4	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that if character precincts are not extended, high density zoned land in Newtown should be rezoned as Medium Density with an 11m height limit.	Rezone High Density Zone land in Newtown as Medium Density Zone.	Accept in part.	Yes.