

**Wellington City Proposed District Plan
Report 4B
City Centre Zone
Waterfront Zone**

**Appendix 2
Recommended Responses to
Submissions and Further Submissions**

City Centre Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Andrew Haddleton	23.2	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that allowing buildings up to 28.5m will remove some of the character of the city and there are other areas where high-rise buildings could go. Instead buildings up to 18m (like the existing Embassy Theatre) will maintain the balanced aesthetic appearance of the street.	Seeks that the allowable building height in the CCZ (City Centre Zone) is sympathetic to the surrounding heritage buildings and character of the city. [[Inferred decision requested]]	Accept in part – changes to CCZ height limits addressed elsewhere in this table	Yes
Mark Tanner	24.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	The CCZ (City Centre Zone) is supported because densification of CBD, Te Aro, and Adelaide Road will accommodate projected population increases.	Retain CCZ (City Centre Zone) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Tim Bright	75.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Opposes the edge of the Mount Victoria suburb being zoned CCZ.	[Not specified]	Reject.	No.
Judith Graykowski	80.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Oppose the Western edge of Mount Victoria being zoned City Centre.	Seeks that the Western edge of Mount Victoria is rezoned	Reject.	No.
Joanna Newman	85.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Opposes the western edge of the legal suburb of Mt Victoria being included in the CCZ (City Centre Zone). Considers that Cambridge Terrace forms the logical eastern boundary of the CCZ. CCZ is incompatible with the current, historical, Wellington City Council and Geographic Board definition of Mount Victoria as a suburb. Mount Victoria distinctive and strong identity to its residents and the city, dating back to its origins in 1840. Its main streets were laid out according to the 1840 plan by William Mein-Smith, surveyor for the New Zealand Company. The current low-rise but historically dense residential area extends well into the area currently designated City Centre Zone and intended for building at least 10 storeys high. Boundaries of the suburb of Mount Victoria are defined, and the suburb named, by The New Zealand Geographic Board and gazetted by Land Information New Zealand. Wellington City Council documents also show the western boundary of Mount Victoria along Cambridge Terrace, putting the islands between the two Terraces in Mount Victoria. Throughout WCC planning documents, including the Draft Spatial Plan, Mount Victoria is references are to the “suburb” of Mount Victoria, which must be understood to mean both the New Zealand Geographic Board and the Wellington City Council defined suburb. When WCC issues resource consents, it classifies consents applied for or granted in the part of Mount Victoria proposed to be zoned City Centre as Mount Victoria. Supports evidence submitted by Mt Victoria Historical Society.	Seeks that the CCZ (City Centre Zone) east of Cambridge Terrace in Mount Victoria be rezoned to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone). [[Inferred decision requested]]	Reject.	No.
Aro Valley Community Council	87.43	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Considers that it would be inappropriate and dangerous to classify 290 Willis Street as a City Centre Zone. The site is adjacent to the dangerous Karo Drive and Willis Street intersection.	Seeks that 290 Willis Street is rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.
Generation Zero	FS54.47	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Aro Valley Community Council	87.44	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Considers that the sites at 290, 292 , 294, 296, 298, 300, 302, 304 and 306 Willis Street were never built to be part of the Central City - and have never operated as part of the Central City. A historical mapping error that gives this impression has been repeatedly acknowledged by the WCC but left unaddressed.	Seeks that 290, 292 , 294, 296, 298, 300, 302, 304 and 306 Willis Street are rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.
Generation Zero	F554.48	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Reject.	No.
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Considers that the western edge of Mt Victoria should not be CCZ (City Centre Zone) Considers that CCZ is incompatible with various definitions of Mt Victoria as a suburb. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the area of Mount Victoria that is CCZ (City Centre Zone) is rezoned to Medium Density Residential Area. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.56	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports all moves towards higher density housing in the CCZ. Supports a focus on high density rather than all housing supply as this is a more sustainable, affordable, resource efficient approach, and promotes connectivity within the city.	Seeks that all moves towards higher density housing in the City Centre Zone are supported. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject.	No.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.57	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	Considers that further steps can be taken to ensure housing quality, affordability and accessibility.	Not specified.	Reject.	No.
Vivienne Morrell	155.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Oppose the Western edge of Mount Victoria being zoned City Centre.	Seeks that the Western edge of Mount Victoria is rezoned.	Reject.	No.
Dr Briar E R Gordon and Dr Lyndsay G M Gordon	156.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to zone much of the area of Thorndon east of the motorway as CCZ, with the implication of high/medium density intensification in the residential and educational area of Selwyn and Guildford Terraces. Considers that the area is surrounded by buildings of high public value and interest, and Selwyn Terrace has a community of heritage houses. The area affords heritage and amenity values to the whole city and is too precious to be subject to the pressures of high density development. Enabling buildings of the proposed heights would be detrimental to the views and also interfere with the important listed viewshafts referred to in Sir Douglas White's submission. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Reject zone change of the area of Thorndon east of the motorway to City Centre Zone.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.68	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	These submissions align with the Association's submissions for the Hobson precinct, the Portland/Hawkestone precinct, and the Selwyn precinct.	Allow	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
James and Karen Fairhall	160.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City. Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.	Seeks that good quality intensification of the CCZ should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.	Reject.	No
James and Karen Fairhall	160.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the current provisions of the PDP, in particular standards CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) and CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height), will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design. Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria. Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Not specified.	Accept in part – changes to interface with Moir Street recommended under submissions relating to CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3.	Yes
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City. Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.	Seeks that good quality intensification of the City Centre Zone should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.	Reject.	No.
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the current provisions of the PDP, in particular standards CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) and CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height), will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design. Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria. Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Not specified.	Accept in part – changes to interface with Moir Street recommended under submissions relating to CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3.	Yes
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City. Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.	Seeks that good quality intensification of the City Centre Zone should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.	Reject.	No.
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the current provisions of the PDP, in particular standards CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) and CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height), will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design. Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria. Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Not specified.	Accept in part – changes to interface with Moir Street recommended under submissions relating to CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3.	Yes
Athena Papadopoulos	183.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City. Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.	Seeks that good quality intensification of the City Centre Zone should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Athena Papadopoulos	183.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the current provisions of the PDP, in particular standards CCZ-S1 (Maximum height), CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height), and CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design.</p> <p>Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria. Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Not specified.	Accept in part – changes to interface with Moir Street recommended under submissions relating to CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3.	Yes
Lara Bland	184.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	<p>Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.</p> <p>Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.</p>	Seeks that good quality intensification of the City Centre Zone should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.	Reject.	No.
Lara Bland	184.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the current provisions of the PDP, in particular standards CCZ-S1 (Maximum height), CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height), and CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design.</p> <p>Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria. Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Not specified.	Accept in part – changes to interface with Moir Street recommended under submissions relating to CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3.	Yes
Geoff Palmer	188.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	<p>Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.</p> <p>Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.</p>	Seeks that good quality intensification of the City Centre Zone should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.	Reject.	No.
Geoff Palmer	188.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the current provisions of the PDP, in particular standards CCZ-S1 (Maximum height), CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height), and CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design.</p> <p>Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria. Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Not specified.	Accept in part – changes to interface with Moir Street recommended under submissions relating to CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3.	Yes
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.19	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that the western edge of Mt Victoria should not be CCZ (City Centre Zone).</p> <p>Considers that CCZ is incompatible with various definitions of Mt Victoria as a suburb.</p> <p>The current low-rise but historically dense residential area extends well into the area currently designated City Centre Zone and intended for building at least 10 storeys high.</p> <p>[refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Seeks that the area of Mount Victoria that is CCZ (City Centre Zone) is rezoned to Medium Density Residential Area.</p> <p>[Inferred Decision Requested].</p>	Reject.	No.
Michael O'Rourke	194.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	<p>Opposes the strip south of the Basin Reserve up Adelaide Road to John Street being zoned as CCZ.</p> <p>Notes that by various measures, including the Wellington Regional Council City Zone for public transport ending at the Basin, this area is not the CBD.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full detail].</p>	Seeks that the Adelaide Road spine is made High Density Residential Zone.	Reject in part – Adelaide Road to be rezoned as Mixed Use Zone	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Angus Hodgson	200.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Support a dense urban centre for Wellington, drawing together our homes, work places, entertainment and leisure spaces, and green spaces.	Seeks that the densification within the CCZ (City Centre Zone) is retained as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Angus Hodgson	200.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports the introduction of minimum height requirements, which will assist in creating more attractive streetscapes generating a coherent rhythm, and more importantly allow for greater density by precluding underdevelopment of City Centre Zone sites.	Retain CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Angus Hodgson	200.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Opposes the effective removal of setback requirements in the CCZ (City Centre Zone). Considers that sense of human scale is important within the urban centre. Considers that setback requirements assist in mitigating negative wind effects, allow for greater natural light on street sides, connections to natural landscape, and reduce the risk of knocking effect in seismic and high wind events.	Seeks the addition of setback requirements that take into account width of the streets and height of a proposed building into the CCZ (City Centre Zone).	Reject.	No.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.32	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports the PDP's emphasis on promoting productive use of City Centre spaces, including requiring accommodation sites to have non-residential use of the ground floor such as cafes, restaurants, dairies, etc.	Retain the City Centre Zone chapter as notified.	Accept.	No.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.33	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the City Centre should be a people-centric place to live, work, and enjoy.	Seeks that the PDP facilitates pedestrianisation of areas such as Cuba street to stimulate business activity and make better use of limited space.	Reject.	No.
Avryl Bramley	202.44	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that Rules currently allow multi story buildings in the Central city to have multiple car parks. Typically these are then used for non- residential dedicated single user park where the vehicle is not used at all during the day. In short the company car loafing in the company car park after a peak hour journey to transport an individual from home to work and return. These cars are expensive in terms of green and require expensive peak hour traffic schemes paid for by the community but benefit only a few. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks addition of rules to limit number of non residential on site in building car parks permitted to those necessary for the service and maintenance of the building plus a small margin over and above.	Reject.	No.
Avryl Bramley	202.45	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that Rules currently allow multi story buildings in the Central city to have multiple car parks. Typically these are then used for non- residential dedicated single user park where the vehicle is not used at all during the day. In short the company car loafing in the company car park after a peak hour journey to transport an individual from home to work and return. These cars are expensive in terms of green and require expensive peak hour traffic schemes paid for by the community but benefit only a few. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks addition of rules to create a sinking lid policy on existing car parks used for those same purposes and to reregister their use into the same categories and newly created parks.	Reject.	No.
Dougal and Libby List	207.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City. Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.	Seeks that good quality intensification of the City Centre Zone should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.	Reject.	No.
Dougal and Libby List	207.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the current provisions of the PDP, in particular standards CCZ-S1 (Maximum height), CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height), and CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design. Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria. Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Not specified.	Accept in part – changes to interface with Moir Street recommended under submissions relating to CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3.	Yes
Craig Forrester	210.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City. Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.	Seeks that good quality intensification of the City Centre Zone should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Craig Forrester	210.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria. Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Not specified.	Accept in part – changes to interface with Moir Street recommended under submissions relating to CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3.	Yes
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Opposes the western edge of the legal suburb of Mt Victoria being included in the CCZ (City Centre Zone). Considers that Cambridge Terrace forms the logical eastern boundary of the CCZ. Considers that CCZ is incompatible with the current, historical, Wellington City Council and Geographic Board definition of Mount Victoria as a suburb. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that the CCZ (City Centre Zone) east of Cambridge Terrace in Mount Victoria be rezoned to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone). [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – changes to interface with Moir Street recommended under submissions relating to CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3.	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.73	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	No specific reason provided.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	233.24	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the operative District Plan strikes an appropriate balance with CCZ encroachment on residential zones by containing central area activities within the central area and a range of nonresidential activities in residential zones, provided character and amenity standards are maintained and adverse effects are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated. The purpose of those provisions in the ODP have been diluted in the PDP. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that policies are added that address encroachment of city centre activities into adjoining residential zones.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.95	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings 10min walkable catchment Specific heritage identification and assessment Views contributing to sense of place and identity Extend Character Precincts per Boffa Miskell Boffa Miskell streetscapes Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings CCZ encroachment on residential zones Old St Pauls height controls Preserve viewshalfs	Allow	Reject.	No.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.55	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Considers that 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.	Retain the provisions applicable to "residential activities" in the City Centre Zone as notified.	Accept.	No.
Generation Zero Inc	254.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the introduction of the chapter should be amended for consistency.	Amend introduction of the City Centre Zone as follows; In locations where rapid transit investment has been signalled measures have been included to enable opportunities for more intensive, comprehensive development to occur, particularly in areas within a walkable distance catchment of planned rapid transit stops.	Accept.	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wheeler Grace Trust	261.2	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	<p>Considers that the opportunity for residential intensification would be better reflected with HRZ (High Density Residential Zone).</p> <p>Changing from Inner Residential to City Centre Zone would drastically change Selwyn Terrace.</p> <p>Opposes the element of the NPS-UD application regarding commercial activities.</p> <p>Selwyn Terrace does not have a mix of land uses - it is all residential except the British High Commission, which has its frontage on Hill Street.</p> <p>For Selwyn Terrace to be CCZ it would need better road access.</p> <p>Selwyn Terrace is unique and has character, making CCZ inappropriate.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that Selwyn Terrace, Thorndon is rezoned as High Density Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.
Steve Dunn	288.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Not specified	Considers that intensification in Newtown should be focussed along Adelaide Road [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that intensification in Newtown should be focussed along Adelaide Road. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers the need for a Design Review Panels for all inner city developments 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.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that a mandatory Design Panel Review be adopted for all inner city developments.	Reject – Urban design panel method introduced but this will not be a mandatory requirement.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.16	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Wellington Civic Trust supports the need for Design Review Panels.	Allow	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.224	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	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	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.224	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	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.	No.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Not specified	Considers that the Council needs to work harder to create good quality meaningful living conditions for residents in Te Aro to ensure that this area will flourish and not become a slum.	Not specified.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that Adelaide Road should not be classified as CCZ. The street is likely unsuitable for the creation of further high-rise areas due to it being the former boggy route of a wetland stream. Medium-rise development to the level of 5-6 storeys and the occasional nine storey tower should be continued.	Remove Adelaide Road from City Centre Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – Adelaide Road rezoned as Mixed Use Zone	Yes
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	<p>Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.</p> <p>Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.</p>	Seeks that good quality intensification of the City Centre Zone is undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the current provisions of the PDP, in particular standards CCZ-S1 (Maximum height), CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height), and CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design.</p> <p>Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria. Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Not specified.	Accept in part – changes to interface with Moir Street recommended under submissions relating to CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3.	Yes
Richard Murcott	322.26	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the Selwyn Terrace residential enclave should be rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Seeks that the Selwyn Terrace residential enclave not be classified as City Centre Zone.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.58	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow	Reject.	No.
Richard Murcott	322.27	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the residential area of Portland Crescent should be rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Seeks that the residential area of Portland Crescent not be classified as City Centre Zone.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.59	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow	Reject.	No.
Richard Murcott	322.28	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the residential area of Hawkestone Street should be rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Seeks that the residential area of Hawkestone Street not be classified as City Centre Zone.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.60	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow	Reject.	No.
Richard Murcott	322.29	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that high density City Centre areas should have incentives to build and densify, potentially through rates. This would take the focus away from densifying Wellington's inner city residential areas that are full of character, green spaces and oftentimes significant heritage.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that incentives be placed to encourage densification in City Centre Zones.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.61	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave should be rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The enclave provides a visual linkage between this residential area and its residential neighbours across the motorway. It is part of the story of the Thorndon community demonstrating the impact the motorway construction had on Thorndon.	<p>Seeks that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave and the Portland Crescent/Hawkestone St cluster not be classified as City Centre Zone, and be re-zoned back to Inner Residential Area, with a qualifying matter as a Character Precinct Area, in a manner consistent with the maps and information appended to the submission.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission]</p>	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave should be rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The enclave provides a visual linkage between this residential area and its residential neighbours across the motorway. It is part of the story of the Thorndon community demonstrating the impact the motorway construction had on Thorndon.	Seeks that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave and the Portland Crescent/Hawkestone St cluster not be classified as City Centre Zone, and be re-zoned back to Inner Residential Area, with a qualifying matter as a Character Precinct Area, in a manner consistent with the maps and information appended to the submission. [Refer to original submission]	Reject.	No.
Property Council New Zealand	338.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports the Proposed District Plan's proposal to encourage more inner city living, greater density of urban form, and more efficient use of sites within the City Centre.	Retain the 'City Centre Zone' chapter as notified.	Accept in part – changes to the chapter are recommended.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Carolyn Stephens	344.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the plan should be amended to more comprehensively provide for enhanced sunlight access to outdoor and indoor living areas. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that enhanced sunlight access be provided to outdoor and indoor living areas.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	F583.17	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	This submission recognises the importance of sunlight for people in central Wellington. Wellington Civic Trust supports this submission, which is also in accordance with its submission seeking more open space and sunlight protection for open space.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.285	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Metropolitan Centre Zone is required.	<p>Add the following new policies in the City Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency:</p> <p><u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</u></p> <p>1. <u>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></p> <p>2. <u>Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they:</u></p> <p>a. <u>May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services.</u></p> <p>b. <u>Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age.</u></p> <p><u>Changing communities</u></p> <p><u>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</u></p> <p><u>Larger sites</u></p> <p><u>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</u></p>	Accept in part – new retirement villages policy is recommended.	Yes
Z Energy Limited	361.95	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	The CCZ is generally supported, as it enables and reinforces the continued primacy of the Wellington central city area as the principal commercial and employment centre servicing the city and metropolitan region. It is also a major employment hub for the region and contains a mix of inner city living, entertainment, educational, government and commercial activity.	Retain the City Centre Zone chapter as notified.	Accept in part – changes to the chapter are recommended	No.
Elizabeth Nagel	368.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the plan should be amended to more comprehensively provide for enhanced sunlight access to outdoor and indoor living areas. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks that enhanced sunlight access be provided to outdoor and indoor living areas.	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi	370.405	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports providing for access to active and public transport activity options, discouraging carparking at ground level and the quality design outcomes.	Retain the City Centre Zone chapter as notified.	Accept in part – changes to the chapter are recommended	No.
Parliamentary Service	375.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Not specified	Submitter notes that in the City Centre Zone, the provisions of the Proposed Plan need to recognise the unique role that the Parliamentary Precinct plays in NZ and that the planning framework provides for the safe, effective and efficient functioning of parliament.	Not specified.	Accept in part – new provisions for the parliamentary precinct recommended	Yes
Parliamentary Service	375.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	As it is currently drafted, the permitted activities in the City Centre Zone do not provide for Parliamentary activities, and therefore resource consent would be required for such activities under CCZ-R16. The Parliamentary Service does not anticipate this to be the intended outcome of this chapter, and suggests that CCZP1 includes a specific reference to Parliamentary activities, and a permitted activity rule is introduced for Parliamentary activities.	Not specified.	Accept in part – new provisions for the parliamentary precinct recommended	Yes
Jane Szentivanyi	376.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose in part	Considers that, as currently drafted, the current provisions of the District Plan will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design. Negative effects would include public and private amenity, reverse sensitivity effects, including along the boundary with adjoining residentially zoned areas, and impacts on character and heritage.	Not specified.	Accept in part – new height limit recommended	Yes
Wellington Civic Trust	388.19	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	The Introduction to the CCZ chapter is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain the Introduction of the City Centre Zone chapter, with amendment.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Civic Trust	388.20	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the Introduction to the CCZ chapter should be amended to clarify the scarcity of available public open space in the City Centre Zone, and how this shortfall is going to be corrected through the Plan and other methods available to the Council. It is noted that provisions that would provide additional public spaces are lacking. A statement recognising the need for additional public spaces in areas that currently fall short of existing needs should be added in the Introduction. The wording should also explain how the shortfall is going to be made up before further residential development is provided for.	Amend the Introduction of the City Centre Zone chapter to state the need for more available public open space in the City Centre Zone and how this shortfall is going to be corrected through the Plan and other methods available to the Council.	Reject.	No.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.97	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that Taranaki Whānui should be engaged as partners in any development as a matter of first priority, as Taranaki Whānui are the hold ahi kā in regard to the city centre zone and development at Te Ngakau Civic Centre. [see original submission]	Seek to amend in chapter, to include Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in the City Centre Zone.	Reject.	No.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.55	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.688	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	The use of standards to manage potential adverse effects across the PDP is generally supported, but changes are sought.	Retain the City Centre Zone chapter with amendment.	Accept in part – changes to the chapter are recommended	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.689	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that CCZ height controls should be amended to ensure the NPSUD and the Housing Supply Act are effectively and efficiently implemented, that intensification is enabled in areas of high accessibility to commercial amenity, community services and public transport, and that height controls enable a transition of height and density within the urban built form from higher heights and densities in centres. There may be a number of other consequential changes needed to standards to give effect to these height adjustments as noted in this submission such as increasing height in associated wind and daylight standards. These changes should be proportionate to the changes in building height sought to address any transition issues between zones and provide for increased levels of intensification.	Amend the City Centre Zone chapter to add a height control of: i. 43m within a 400m walkable catchment of a City Centre Zone ii. 36m within a 400-1500m walkable catchment of a City Centre Zone.	Reject.	No.
Ann Mallinson	FS3.33	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the city centre zone (43m within a 400m walkable catchment of the CCZ and 36m within a 400-1500m walkable catchment of the CCZ) go well beyond the requirements of NPS-UD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values of the surrounding inner city suburbs.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Oriental Bay Residents Association	FS13.8	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the city centre zone goes well beyond the requirements of NPS-UD and are inappropriate in light of amenity and other values of the surrounding inner city suburbs.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ruapapa Limited	FS18.10	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the city centre zone go well beyond the requirements of NPS-UD and are inappropriate in light of amenity and other values of the surrounding inner city suburbs.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Scott Galloway and Carolyn McLean	FS19.8	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the city centre zone (43m within a 400m walkable catchment of the CCZ and 36m within a 400-1500m walkable catchment of the CCZ) go well beyond the requirements of NPS-UD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values of the surrounding inner city suburbs.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Jenny Gyles	FS53.8	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Considers that the proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the city centre zone goes well beyond the requirements of NPS-UD and are inappropriate in light of amenity and other values of the surrounding inner city suburbs.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Helen Foot	FS62.35	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Proposed increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the city centre zone goes well beyond the requirements of NPS-UD and are inappropriate in light of exposed weather conditions in Oriental Bay.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.108	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Considers the increases in height controls within walkable catchments of the city centre zone goes well beyond requirements of NPS-UD and are inappropriate in light of amenity values of the surrounding inner city suburbs.	Disallow	Accept.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.49	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	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.	No.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.38	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	We oppose the submission to introduce new height limits around the CCZ. These are not required and will have significant impact on residential areas.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.37	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Roland Sapsford opposes the submission to introduce new height limits around the CCZ. These are not required and will have significant impact on residential areas.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.69	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	Generally supports the introduction and application of a City Centre Zone in the Proposed District Plan. Considers that an amendment is needed to delete Comprehensive development from the Introduction as there are no rules to implement this approach.	Retain introduction of the City Centre Zone as notified and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.691	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Generally supports the introduction and application of a City Centre Zone in the Proposed District Plan. Considers that an amendment is needed to delete Comprehensive development from the Introduction as there are no rules to implement this approach.	Amend the eighth paragraph of the introduction of the City Centre Zone as follows: In locations where rapid transit investment has been signalled measures have been included to enable opportunities for more intensive, comprehensive development to occur, particularly in areas within a walkable distance of planned rapid transit stops.	Reject.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.43	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose in part	Opposes the Proposed Plan in part.	Seeks amendment to the City Centre Zone to enable well-functioning urban environments in the City Centre zone.	Reject.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.44	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports the recognition of the City Centre as the primary centre serving the wider Wellington region. Supports the creation of well-functioning urban environments, which is consistent with the NPS-UD.	Retain CCZ (City Centre Zone) - Introduction as notified.	Accept.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.77	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Submission point 404.44 supports FSNI submission points 476.96 - 476.99	Allow	Accept.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.45	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the 90m Height Control Overlay should extend over 141 The Terrace, 294 and 298 Lambton Quay so it is contiguous with the height control applying to 312 Lambton Quay and other sites to the south.	Amend 90m Height Control Overlay to extend over 141 The Terrace, 294 and 298 Lambton Quay. [Refer to original submission for maps of the submitter's properties under the Proposed District Plan].	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Guy Marriage	407.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that if Te Aro is to flourish, and not to become a slum, then the WCC need to work far harder to create good quality meaningful living conditions for Te Aro residents. One of the key aspects of this will be the adoption of equally good measures for access to sunlight and daylight to the residents of the far more dense streets of Te Aro and the rest of Central. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks the addition of the set-back provisions from the Draft District Plan (required developments on narrow streets to have step back as they rose higher, so as to stop the obliteration of daylight and sunlight to the residents on lower levels).	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.160	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Considers that set backs in narrow streets will enhance liveability and wellbeing for residents in high density residential areas and is a longstanding technique for achieving good quality density.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Guy Marriage	407.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the increases in height limits in the CCZ leaves all existing home owners in buildings 69 storeys tall now facing the prospect of being surrounded by towers 14-20 storeys tall, casting long deep shadows for entire blocks southwards. The effect on the existing buildings will be massive, severe, and will have a catastrophic effect on property values. The strategy of creating Te Aro as an area suitable for the continued clustering of tall towers is badly flawed. Geologically the Te Aro Basin is crisscrossed with the remains of several small creeks, leading down to what was formerly a swamp filled with eels, and a channel from Newtown, through the Basin Reserve, down to the sea near the present Waitangi Park. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks that building heights in Te Aro are restricted to 5 - 6 storeys, with the occasional 9 storey towers. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.162	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Allow	Reject.	No.
Guy Marriage	407.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the extension of the CCZ down Adelaide Road is flawed, as this is the lowest point on the path from Newtown to the Basin and is also the former boggy route of a wetland stream, so will be unsuitable for the creation of high rises.	Seeks that the City Centre Zone chapter is not extended along Adelaide Road.	Accept in part – Adelaide Road will be rezoned as Mixed Use Zone	Yes
Guy Marriage	407.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers the addition of a setback standard important to ensure daylight into living spaces. Considers that the Sydney Design is a appropriate method. [See original submission for full reason]	Seeks the addition of a setback standard to narrow streets in the City Centre Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.161	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Considers that set backs in narrow streets will enhance liveability and wellbeing for residents in high density residential areas and is a longstanding technique for achieving good quality density.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.138	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Submitter is seeking fewer prescriptive standards. Submitter considers that Wellington needs to ensure that we are not unnecessarily preventing innovation by prescribing housing standards, such as minimum unit sizes and outdoor living space requirements (in particular, within the City Centre Zone). While the standards currently drafted will be appropriate for many uses, they may not suit everyone and they do not respond to emerging trends in apartment design. The standards also risk stifling affordable housing within the City Centre Zone by preventing more affordable building typologies.	Seeks to remove the extent of prescriptive standards, such as minimum unit sizes and outdoor living spaces (in particular, within the City Centre Zone). [Inferred decision requested].	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.139	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	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.
Fabric Property Limited	425.56	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	Supports the objectives and policies for the City Centre zone generally, and specifically supports the recognition of the City Centre as the primary commercial and employment centre for the wider region (CCZ-O1), the recognition of the role of the City Centre in accommodating growth (CCZ-O2), the enablement of the most intensive form of development concentrated in the zone (CCZ-O3), and the recognition of the benefits of intensification (CCZ-P5).	Seeks that the City Centre Zone chapter is retained as notified, with amendments.	Accept in part.	No.
Christie Potter	446.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City. Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.	Seeks that good quality intensification of the City Centre Zone should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Chrissie Potter	446.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the current provisions of the PDP, in particular standards CCZ-S1 (Maximum height), CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height), and CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design.</p> <p>Considers that Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria.</p> <p>Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Not specified.	Accept in part – changes to interface with Moir Street recommended under submissions relating to CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3.	Yes
Dorothy Thompson	449.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	<p>Supports the intent of the PDP to enable good quality intensification of the CCZ but this should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.</p> <p>Considers that density done well should be the bottom line, not density at all costs.</p>	Seeks that good quality intensification of the City Centre Zone should be undertaken in a way that also maintains the character, amenity, and heritage of the City.	Reject.	No.
Dorothy Thompson	449.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the current provisions of the PDP, in particular standards CCZ-S1 (Maximum height), CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height), and CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design.</p> <p>Considers that Moir Street is recognised as one of the key coherent character and heritage areas of Mt Victoria.</p> <p>Considers that as a designated heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. It is unique in the PDP as being the only location in all of Wellington that is MRZ, a character precinct, heritage area, and adjacent to the CCZ. Therefore the specific changes requested in relation to avoiding significant adverse impacts on Moir Street do not have wider ramifications for the Council's intensification plans.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	Not specified.	Accept in part – changes to interface with Moir Street recommended under submissions relating to CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3.	Yes
David Lee	454.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Oppose	Opposes City Centre Zoning for the Western edge of Mt Victoria.	Seeks to rezone Western edge of Mt Victoria from being City Centre Zone.	Reject.	No.
Catherine Penetito	474.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Not specified	<p>Considers that Pukeahu National War Memorial Park should have sunlight protection for the whole area if it is to be maintained and enhanced.</p> <p>The Hall of Memories, the Carillon and the old museum building are too important to be overshadowed by residential or other buildings.</p>	Seeks that the building height zones adjacent to Item 40 (National War Memorial and Carillon) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings is reconsidered to ensure it is not overshadowed.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	F583.18	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Wellington Civic Trust supports these submissions, which are in accordance with its submission seeking more open space and sunlight protection for open space in Central Wellington.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Catherine Penetito	474.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Not specified	<p>Considers that Pukeahu National War Memorial Park should have sunlight protection for the whole area if it is to be maintained and enhanced.</p> <p>The Hall of Memories, the Carillon and the old museum building are too important to be overshadowed by residential or other buildings.</p>	Seeks that the building height zones adjacent to Item 41 (National/Dominion Museum and National Art Gallery (former)) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings is reconsidered to ensure it is not overshadowed.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	F583.19	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Wellington Civic Trust supports these submissions, which are in accordance with its submission seeking more open space and sunlight protection for open space in Central Wellington.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Catherine Penetito	474.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Not specified	Considers that Pukeahu National War Memorial Park should have sunlight protection for the whole area if it is to be maintained and enhanced.	Seeks that the building height zones adjacent to Item 42 (Home of Compassion Crèche (former)) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings is reconsidered to ensure it is not overshadowed.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	F583.20	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Wellington Civic Trust supports these submissions, which are in accordance with its submission seeking more open space and sunlight protection for open space in Central Wellington.	Allow	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Catherine Penetito	474.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Not specified	Considers that Pukeahu National War Memorial Park should have sunlight protection for the whole area if it is to be maintained and enhanced.	Seeks that the building height zones adjacent to Item 424 (Army Headquarters (former)) in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings is reconsidered to ensure it is not overshadowed.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.21	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Wellington Civic Trust supports these submissions, which are in accordance with its submission seeking more open space and sunlight protection for open space in Central Wellington.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.96	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports the City Centre Zoning of New World Railway Metro (2 Bunny Street, Pipitea).	Retain City Centre Zoning of New World Railway Metro (2 Bunny Street, Pipitea) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.97	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports the City Centre Zoning of New World Willis Street Metro (70 Willis Street, Wellington Central).	Retain City Centre Zoning of New World Willis Street Metro (70 Willis Street, Wellington Central) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.98	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports the City Centre Zoning of New World Wellington City (279 Wakefield Street, Te Aro).	Retain City Centre Zoning New World Wellington City (279 Wakefield Street, Te Aro) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.99	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Supports the City Centre Zoning of New World Thorndon (150 Molesworth Street).	Retain City Centre Zoning of New World Thorndon (150 Molesworth Street) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Living Streets Aotearoa	482.59	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that tall buildings around spaces are creating shade and wind problems. [Refer to original submission for full detail].	Seeks that in any future developments, the effect on adjacent public spaces is addressed.	Accept in part.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.100	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support	Provision of medium density housing zones Provision of Character Precincts. Tall buildings create wind and shade problems	Allow	Reject.	No.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.79	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Support in part	Supports mention of active engagement with mana whenua in the development of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct in the chapter introduction.	Retain introduction of the City Centre zone with amendment.	Accept.	Yes
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	Amend	Considers that the introduction to the chapter statement could be improved by requiring partnership with mana whenua in the development of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct.	Amend the introduction of the City Centre zone to require partnership with mana whenua in the development of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct.	Accept.	Yes
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	70.35	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ-PPREC01	Support	Supports in its entirety CCZ-PPREC01 (Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct and considers that they adequately address the unique range of factors, including heritage, which need to be considered in any (re)development of this area.	Retain CCZ-PPREC01 in its entirety as notified.	Accept.	Yes
Onslow Historical Society	FS6.25	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ-PPREC01	Support	OHS supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate activities.	Allow	Accept.	Yes
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS11.24	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ-PPREC01	Support	HPW supports robust provisions for protecting historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision or development in accordance with s.6 of the RMA.	Allow	Accept.	Yes
Wellington Civic Trust	388.21	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ-PPREC01	Support in part	The recognition of Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct within the Central City Zone (CCZ-PPREC01), and the specific introductory statement and aims that apply to the Precinct are supported. However, an amendment to the wording is sought.	Retain CCZ-PPREC01 (Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.22	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ-PPREC01	Amend	Considers that wording in CCZ-PPREC01 should be clarified. Wording in the introductory sentence portrays the precinct as redevelopment area. The findings of a seminar run by the Civic Trust in 2021 were that people seek to retain as much as possible of the existing buildings, structures and spaces for reuse, rather than demolition and replacement buildings. It is sought that this is reflected in the introductory statement.	Amend wording in CCZ-PPREC01 (Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct) as follows: The purpose of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct is to provide for civic activities, functions, public use and areas of open space and redevelopment. Any future change in the precinct must ensure that development of change while ensuring that any future development respects the special qualities of the area, including the concentration of listed heritage buildings.	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	FS12.1	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ-PPREC01	Oppose	Willis Bond and Company Limited consider references to new development and redevelopment within Te Ngākau in CCZ-PPREC01 should be retained as they are relevant to certain parts of Te Ngākau such as the Michael Fowler carpark site and they reflect Te Ngākau Civic Precinct Framework adopted by Council.	Disallow	Accept.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	FS12.2	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZPREC01-P2	Oppose	Willis Bond and Company Limited consider references to new development and redevelopment within Te Ngākau in CCZ-PREC01-P2 should be retained as they are relevant to certain parts of Te Ngākau such as the Michael Fowler carpark site and they reflect Te Ngākau Civic Precinct Framework adopted by Council.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.165	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ-PREC01	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Allow	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.140	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZPREC01	Amend	Submitter agrees that the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct (TNCSPP) needs to be a vibrant and welcoming space. It also needs to be able to adapt in years to come to Wellington's changing needs. Given the intention to demolish CAB (and possibly MOB) is it appropriate to refer to them in this Policy?	Amend CCZ-PREC01 (Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct) as follows: CCZ-PREC01 Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct ... The Precinct is Wellington's unique civic place. It is located in the heart of the City Centre and is a destination in itself. It is also an anchor point and gateway that connects the city centre's entertainment area, the waterfront and the Central Business District. Wellington's major civic and entertainment venues are located within the precinct, including the Wellington Town Hall, City Gallery Wellington (Te Whare Toi), Wellington City Library (Te Matapihi), Michael Fowler Centre, Civic Administration Building, Municipal Office Building, and Capital E. ...	Accept.	Yes
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.22	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ-PREC01	Oppose	The two buildings that are sought to be removed from mention in the introduction to the Te Ngākau Precinct are part of the existing precinct. The Wellington Civic Trust opposes their removal from the description. It is inappropriate to presume that they do not form part of the existing character and quality of the Precinct.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Paul Burnaby	44.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	Considers that the Draft provision CCZ-R21 (Comprehensive development of land 2000sqm in area or greater) should be 'reinstated' in the now notified City Centre Zone provisions.	Seeks that Draft District Plan CCZ-R21 is reinstated.	Reject.	No.
Jill Wilson	218.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	Considers that the minimum requirements for apartments in new apartment buildings may not suffice for emergency supplies storage. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Seeks amendment to require new apartment buildings to incorporate adequate storage of emergency supplies for residents.	Reject.	No.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of	240.56	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre	Amend	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	Amend the land use activity rule framework for the City Centre Zone to include a new permitted activity rule applying to "supported residential care activities" as follows, if the definition of	Accept in part.	No.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	Considers that there should be a set-back standard for narrow streets and lanes to ensure daylight to living spaces in the CCZ. The Sydney Design Standard is considered an appropriate method to use.	Seeks a setback standard is added in the City Centre Zone.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.286	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	Considers policy support for retirement villages in the Metropolitan Centre Zone is required.	Add the following new policies in the City Centre Zone chapter and amend current objectives and policies for consistency: <u>Provision of housing for an ageing population</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. 2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they: a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services. b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age. <u>Changing communities</u> To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities. <u>Larger sites</u> Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.	Accept in part – new policy for retirement villages is recommended.	Yes
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.287	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	Considers that as currently drafted retirement villages would be a permitted or discretionary activity under the 'residential activities' rule of the City Centre Zone (CCZ—R12). Considers that the City Centre Zone should have a retirement village specific rule that provides for retirement villages as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement villages being a restricted discretionary activity under CCZ-R20), recognising that retirement villages provide substantial benefit by way of 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.	Add the following "retirement villages" rule into the City Centre Zone chapter: <u>CCZ-RX Retirement villages</u> 1. Activity status: Permitted	Accept in part.	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Parliamentary Service	375.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that a new Precinct should be recognised in the CCZ chapter. The Parliamentary Precinct and the activities that occur on that Precinct should be recognised in at least as enabling a way as the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct has been in the City Centre Zone. The Parliamentary Precinct is distinct from any other area in the Wellington district, and the district plan provisions should ensure that the uniqueness is acknowledged, as well as ensuring that the Precinct can continue to be used for its Parliamentary purpose.</p> <p>It is submitted that the Parliamentary Precinct is of at least as much significance as the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct, and should therefore be recognised in the planning provisions in a similar way. It is essential that the Parliamentary Precinct can continue to be fit for its Parliamentary purpose. The planning framework should therefore enable the use of the land to continue to be able to respond to the changing needs of Parliament.</p> <p>These Parliamentary Precinct provisions could be analogous to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objectives: CCZ-PREC-01, CCZ-PREC-02, CCZ-PREC-03 - Policies: CCZ-PREC01-P1, CCZ-PREC01-P2, CCZPREC01- P3, CCZ-PREC01-P4 - Rules: CCZ-PREC01-R1, CCZ-PREC01-R2, CCZ-PREC01- R3, CCZ-PREC01-R4, CCZ-PREC01-R5, CCZPREC01-R6, CCZ-PREC01-R7, and CCZ-PREC01-R7 - Standard: CCZ-PREC01-S1. 	<p>Seeks that the Parliamentary Precinct be recognised in planning provisions in a similar way to the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct.</p> <p>These Parliamentary Precinct provisions could be analogous to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objectives: CCZ-PREC-01, CCZ-PREC-02, CCZ-PREC-03 - Policies: CCZ-PREC01-P1, CCZ-PREC01-P2, CCZPREC01- P3, CCZ-PREC01-P4 - Rules: CCZ-PREC01-R1, CCZ-PREC01-R2, CCZ-PREC01- R3, CCZ-PREC01-R4, CCZ-PREC01-R5, 	Accept in part.	Yes
Parliamentary Service	375.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ rules need to be clarified to make clear that Parliamentary activities are permitted in the City Centre Zone – because such activities do not clearly fall within any of the activities listed at CCZ-P1. It is submitted that a new permitted activity rule is therefore required to ensure that parliamentary activities are provided for in this zone.</p>	<p>Add new Rule in the City Centre Zone chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>CCC-R13 Parliamentary activities</u></p> <p><u>1. Permitted</u></p>	Accept in part.	Yes
Wellington Civic Trust	388.23	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the City Centre Zone chapter should have an additional Rule immediately before or after CCZ-PREC01-R7. Demolition of buildings should be made a separate category of activity within the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct, separate from the City Centre applicable rule. All demolitions relating to the Precinct should be carefully considered and publicly notified.</p> <p>At present it appears that there is no ability for the acceptability of demolition of an existing building or structure to be considered as a separate matter from the development of a consented new building or creation of public space. It is noted that the current rule for demolition of buildings does not refer to the rule by which a new building in the Precinct may seek consent, CCZR18, which may be a lacuna in the plan or a deliberate omission.</p>	<p>Add new Rule in the City Centre Zone chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>CCZPREC01-RXX: Demolition or removal of buildings and structures in the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct</u></p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Permitted Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. The demolition or removal of a building is required to avoid an imminent threat to life and/or property.</u></p> <p><u>2. Activity status: Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where the demolition or removal of a building or structure: i. Enables the creation of public space; or ii. Is required for the purposes of constructing a new building or adding to or altering an existing building.</u></p> <p><u>3. Activity status: Non-complying</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. Compliance with any of the requirements of CCZPRE-RXX1 or 2 cannot be achieved.</u></p> <p><u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-PRE-RXX 2 or 3 must be publicly notified.</u></p>	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.166	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Allow	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.24	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that the City Centre Zone chapter should have an additional Rule for the Precinct that relates to the modification of existing open space or the development of new open space. for the An additional rule similar to that in the Waterfront Zone is sought.</p>	<p>Add new Rule in the City Centre Zone chapter as follows:</p> <p><u>CCZPRE-RXXX: Development of new public space, or modification of existing public open space in the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct</u></p> <p><u>1. Activity status: Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>The assessment of the activity must have regard to the Principles and Outcomes in the Wellington City Council Design Guides Introduction [2022].</u></p> <p><u>Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-PRE-RXXX must be publicly notified.</u></p>	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.167	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Allow	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	408.129	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	<p>Considers that building setbacks are essential to address significant safety hazards associated with the operational rail corridor.</p> <p>Parts of the KiwiRail network adjoin commercial and mixed use zones that do not currently include provision for boundary setbacks for buildings and structures.</p> <p>KiwiRail seek a boundary setback of 5m from the rail corridor for all buildings and structures, and that the rail corridor be recognised as a qualifying matter in relevant non-residential zones in accordance with section 77(1)(o) of the RMA.</p> <p>Consistent with the amendment requested for the assessment criteria in the residential zones, KiwiRail considers that a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with in all zones adjacent to the railway corridor.</p>	<p>Add new standard as follows:</p> <p><u>CCZ-SX:</u> <u>Boundary setbacks</u> <u>Buildings or structures must not be located within a 5m setback from a rail corridor boundary.</u></p> <p>AND seeks that as applicable, the following matter of discretion be inserted:</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion:</u> <u>(X) The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u></p>	Accept in part – a 1.5 m setback is recommended.	Yes
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.40	Part 3 / Commercial and Mixed Use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	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.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.141	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	<p>Submitter considers that the activities that are permitted overlook Educational Facilities.</p> <p>Submitter considers that generally, the activities considered in this section are very narrow – for example, childcare activities are not permitted, which is a current activity within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.</p>	Seeks that at minimum, add a new rule as CCZ-PREC01-R7 for Educational Facilities as a Permitted activity status and re-number CCZ-PREC01-R7 (all other land use activities) (currently CCZ-PREC01R7) to CCZ-PREC01-R8.	Accept.	yes
Catharine Underwood	481.32	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / New CCZ	Amend	Considers that all new buildings in the inner city should have a minimum set back of at least 1.5 (2m is better) 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. A good example of why larger set backs are needed in The Paddington on Taranaki Street, which was meant to have several street trees lining the pavement and softening the development, as part of the consent but ended up with no trees due to underground services like pipes, telecommunications, electricity and sewerage. If there had been a setback, a green front would have been possible. The residents of The Paddington and Wellington are the poorer because of this.	<p>Add a new Standard in the City Centre Zone chapter setting boundary setbacks of at least 1.5m for all new buildings.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested]</p>	Reject.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.26	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-01	Support	No specific reason provided.	Retain CCZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.173	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-01	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.96	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-01	Support	CCZ-01 is supported as it recognises that the City Centre (CC) is the primary commercial and employment centre serving Wellington and the wider region and seeks to provide a well-functioning urban environment through the provision of range and access to, a range of residential, commercial and community activities.	Retain Objective CCZ-01 (Purpose) a notified.	Accept.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.92	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-01	Support	Supports the objectives of the City Centre zone to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre	Retain CCZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.692	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-01	Support	Supports CCZ-01.	Retain CCZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.46	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-01	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone objectives to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre.	Retain CCZ-01 (Purpose) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Paul Burnaby	44.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-02	Support	With the confirmation of the provisions supports and the requested changes d, the District Plan provisions will more closely align with and implement the directive policies under the NNPS-UD, in particular Policy 3(a) which requires that district plans enable "in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification"	Retain CCZ-02 (Accommodating growth) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.27	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-02	Support	No specific reason provided.	Retain CCZ-02 (Accommodating growth) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.308	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-02	Support	Supports the objective a the zone has sufficient serviced development capacity meet its short, medium and long term residential and business growth needs.	Retain CCZ-02 (Accommodating growth) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.174	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-02	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-02 (Accommodating growth) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.97	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-02	Support	CCZ-02 is supported as it recognises that the City Centre (CC) is the primary commercial and employment centre serving Wellington and the wider region and seeks to provide a well-functioning urban environment through the provision of range and access to,	Retain Objective CCZ-02 (Accommodating growth) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.93	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-02	Support	Supports the objectives of the City Centre zone to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre	Retain CCZ-02 (Accommodating growth) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.693	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-02	Support in part	Supports CCZ-02, but considers amendment is required that clarifies that the Central City Zone contains high density residential living rather than medium density housing.	Retain CCZ-01 (Accommodating growth) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.694	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-02	Amend	Supports CCZ-02, but considers amendment is required that clarifies that the Central City Zone contains high density residential living rather than medium density housing	Amend CCZ-01 (Accommodating growth) as follows: The City Centre Zone plays a significant role in accommodating residential, business and supporting community service growth, and has sufficient serviced development capacity to meet its short, medium and long term residential and business growth needs, including: 1. A choice of building type, size, affordability and distribution, including forms of medium and high density residential living housing;	Accept in part.	Yes
Ministry of Education	400.142	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-02	Support in part	Supports CCZ-02 in part.	Retain CCZ-02 (Accommodating growth) with amendment.	Accept.	Yes
Ministry of Education	400.143	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-02	Amend	Seeks CCZ-02 be amended to explicitly recognise and provide for educational activities to in the CCZ.	Amend CCZ-02 (Accommodating growth) as follows: Accommodating growth The City Centre Zone plays a significant role in accommodating residential, business and supporting community service growth, and has sufficient serviced development capacity and additional infrastructure to meet its short, medium and long term residential and business growth needs, including: ... 4. Convenient access to a range of open space, including green space, and supporting commercial activity, and community facility options and educational facilities.	Accept in part.	Yes
Oyster Management Limited	404.47	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-02	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone objectives to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre.	Retain CCZ-02 (Accommodating growth) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.142	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-02	Support	Supports the direction of CCZ-02 to provide for a choice of building type, size, affordability and distribution, including forms of medium and high-density housing.	Retain CCZ-02 (Accommodating growth) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Paul Burnaby	44.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-03	Support	With the confirmation of the provisions supports and the requested changes d, the District Plan provisions will more closely align with and implement the directive policies under the NNPS-UD, in particular Policy 3(a) which requires that district plans enable "in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification"	Retain CCZ-03 (Urban form and scale) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.28	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-03	Support	No specific reason provided.	Retain CCZ-03 (Urban form and scale) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.175	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-03	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-03 (Urban Form and scale) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.98	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-03	Support	CCZ-03 is supported as it recognises that the City Centre (CC) is the primary commercial and employment centre serving Wellington and the wider region and seeks to provide a well-functioning urban environment through the provision of range and access to,	Retain Objective CCZ-03 (Urban Form and Scale) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.94	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-03	Support	Supports the objectives of the City Centre zone to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre	Retain CCZ-03 (Urban form and scale) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.695	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-03	Support	Supports CCZ-03.	Retain CCZ-03 (Urban form and scale) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.48	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-03	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone objectives to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre.	Retain CCZ-03 (Urban form and scale) as notified.	Accept.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.143	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-03	Support	Supports the scale and form of development within the city centre being the highest and most intensive form of development within the city.	Retain CCZ-03 (Urban form and scale) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.176	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-04	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-04 (Ahi Kā) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.99	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-04	Support	CCZ-04 is supported as it recognises that the City Centre (CC) is the primary commercial and employment centre serving Wellington and the wider region and seeks to provide a well-functioning urban environment through the provision of range and access to,	Retain Objective CCZ-04 (Ahi Kā) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.95	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-04	Support	Supports the objectives of the City Centre zone to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre	Retain CCZ-04 (Ahi Ka) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.98	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-04	Support in part	Supports CCZ-04 (Ahi Kā) in principle.	Retain CCZ-04 (Ahi Kā) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.696	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-04	Support	Supports CCZ-04.	Retain CCZ-04 (Ahi Kā) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.49	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-04	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone objectives to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre.	Retain CCZ-04 (Ahi Ka) as notified.	Accept.	No.
VictLabour	414.42	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-04	Support	Supportive of ahi ka provisions	Retain CCZ-04 (Ahi kā) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept.	No.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.81	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-04	Amend	Considers that the objective should require partnership with mana whenua rather than engagement.	Seeks that CCZ-04 (Ahi Kā) be amended to provide for partnership with mana whenua in terms of development.	Reject.	No.
Paul Burnaby	44.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	With the confirmation of the provisions supports and the requested changes, the District Plan provisions will more closely align with and implement the directive policies under the NNPS-UD, in particular Policy 3(a) which requires that district plans enable "in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification"	Retain CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.309	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	Supports the objective as it seeks to produce a resilient urban environment that effectively adapts and responds to natural hazard risks, such as fire.	Retain CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.177	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.100	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	CCZ-05 is supported as it recognises that the City Centre (CC) is the primary commercial and employment centre serving Wellington and the wider region and seeks to provide a well-functioning urban environment through the provision of range and access to,	Retain Objective CCZ-05 (Amenity and Design) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.476	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	The submitter strongly support this objective due to its emphasis on the need for climate change resilience and green space within the CBD. It does this alongside successfully balancing the maintenance and improvement of Wellington's important modern and heritage cultural sites demonstrating that ensuring Wellington's long term resilience and sustainability need not involve any loss of what makes Wellington, Wellington.	Retain CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	F583.29	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	This submission is in line with the general submission of Wellington Civic Trust (388.20) which seeks recognition of the need for more open space for a growing central city population.	Allow	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.96	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	Supports the objectives of the City Centre zone to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre	Retain CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.99	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support in part	Supports CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) in principle.	Retain CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.697	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support in part	Supports CCZ-05, but considers that an amendment is required to balances the need to contribute to the amenity of neighbouring residential areas while achieving anticipated built form in accordance with the NPS-UD.	Retain CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) and seeks amendment.	Accept.	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.698	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Amend	Supports CCZ-05, but considers that an amendment is required to balances the need to contribute to the amenity of neighbouring residential areas while achieving anticipated built form in accordance with the NPS-UD.	Amend CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as follows: Development in the City Centre Zone positively contributes to creating a high quality, wellfunctioning urban environment, including: ... 4. Contributing to the general amenity of neighbouring residential areas <u>while achieving the anticipated urban form of each zone</u> ;	Accept in part.	Yes.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	F5103.23	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	It is appropriate that the policy direction acknowledge the anticipated built form each zone and not unintentionally prevent that from being realised.	Allow	Accept in part.	Yes.
Oyster Management Limited	404.50	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone objectives to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre. In particular, supports CCZ-05's direction regarding producing a resilient urban environment that effectively adapts and responds to natural hazard risks and the effects of climate change.	Retain CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.80	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Support	Supports this objective including 'Acknowledging and sensitively responding to adjoining heritage buildings, heritage areas and areas and sites of significance to Māori.'	Retain CCZ-05 (Amenity and Design) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.144	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-05	Amend	Submitter considers that the requirement to acknowledge and respond to heritage buildings and areas should only apply where those heritage areas immediately adjoin the relevant development.	Amend CCZ-05 (Amenity and design) as follows: Development in the City Centre Zone positively contributes to creating a high quality, wellfunctioning urban environment, including: ... 7. Acknowledging and sensitively responding to <u>immediately</u> adjoining heritage buildings, heritage areas and areas and sites of significance to Māori.	Reject.	No.
Paul Burnaby	44.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-06	Support	With the confirmation of the provisions supports and the requested changes, the District Plan provisions will more closely align with and implement the directive policies under the NNPS-UD, in particular Policy 3(a) which requires that district plans enable "in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification"	Retain CCZ-06 (Development near rapid transit) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.178	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-06	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-06 (Development near rapid transit) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.101	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-06	Support	CCZ-06 is supported as it recognises that the City Centre (CC) is the primary commercial and employment centre serving Wellington and the wider region and seeks to provide a well-functioning urban environment through the provision of range and access to,	Retain Objective CCZ-06 (Development near rapid transit) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.97	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-06	Support	Supports the objectives of the City Centre zone to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre	Retain CCZ-06 (Development near rapid transit) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.699	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-06	Support	Supports CCZ-06	Retain CCZ-06 (Development near rapid transit) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.51	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-06	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone objectives to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre.	Retain CCZ-06 (Development near rapid transit) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.179	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-07	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.102	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-07	Support	CCZ-07 is supported as it recognises that the City Centre (CC) is the primary commercial and employment centre serving Wellington and the wider region and seeks to provide a well-functioning urban environment through the provision of range and access to,	Retain Objective CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.98	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-07	Support	Supports the objectives of the City Centre zone to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre	Retain CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.100	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-07	Support in part	Supports CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) in principle.	Retain CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.700	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-07	Support in part	Supports CCZ-07, but considers that an amendment is required to recognise that adverse effects do not include significant changes to an area anticipated by the planned urban built form in accordance with the NPS-UD.	Retain CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.701	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-07	Amend	Supports CCZ-07, but considers that an amendment is required to recognise that adverse effects do not include significant changes to an area anticipated by the planned urban built form in accordance with the NPS-UD.	Amend CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: Adverse effects of activities and development <u>beyond the planned urban built form anticipated</u> in the City Centre Zone are managed effectively both: ...	Reject.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.52	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-07	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone objectives to the extent that they give effect to the NPS-UD and reflect the importance of the city centre.	Retain CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.145	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-07	Amend	Submitter considers that the reference to “interfaces” is too broad and could refer to an indeterminate area. Interface areas need to be properly identifiable.	Amend CCZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: Adverse effects of activities and development in the City Centre Zone are managed effectively both: 1. Within the City Centre Zone; and 2. <u>At interfaces with Where such activities or development immediately adjoin:</u> ...	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.25	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-01	Support	CCZ-PREC01-01 is generally supported.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-01 (Purpose) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.146	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-01	Amend	Submitter considers that reference to Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct as being supported by a range of activities that “complement its primary civic function” may unintentionally and unnecessarily narrow the scope of activities in Te Ngākau. CCZ-PREC01 refers to the long-term vision for Te Ngākau as the “beating heart” of Wellington. The submitter considers that appropriate activities should be those that support this aspiration.	Amend CCZ-PREC01-01 (Purpose) as follows: Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct is a vibrant, safe, resilient, connected and inclusive environment supported by a range of activities that complement its primary <u>do not detract from its civic function.</u> Or as follows: Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct is a vibrant, safe, resilient, connected and inclusive environment supported by a range of activities that complement its primary civic function <u>help to create a vibrant and welcoming space.</u>	Reject.	No.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.150	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-01	Oppose	Considers the primary civic function of this precinct is important and ought to be recognised.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.23	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-01	Oppose	The civic function of the Te Ngākau Square Precinct is absolutely fundamental to its future. Otherwise it just becomes another part of the central city – the “beating heart” would not exist without these public functions and components.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.46	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-01	Oppose	The primary civic function of this precinct is important and ought to be recognised.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.477	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-02	Amend	The submitter generally supports the built form Objective for Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct. However, considers that the objective does not provide for a ‘green environment’ as described in the preamble introduction to the City Centre Zone chapter. The submitter suggests an additional requirement is added to provide for green space and encourage indigenous biodiversity where possible. The submitter believes Civic square could set the standard for how built form can be designed and managed to encourage and increase indigenous biodiversity for the rest of the city.	Amend CCZ-PREC01-02 (Built form) to add an additional Point 7, as follows: The scale, form and positioning of development within the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct: 7. <u>Provides for green spaces and encourages indigenous biodiversity where possible.</u>	Accept.	Yes
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.30	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-02	Support	Wellington Civic Trust considers that the current Civic Square – a multi-purpose paved space – is essential to the area’s future, just as it was until effectively under-maintained by the Council. The Civic Trust does however recognise that there may be a place for more planting and ecosystem reinstatement within the Precinct without losing what is already there.	Allow	Accept.	Yes
Wellington Civic Trust	388.26	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-02	Support	CCZ-PREC01-02 is generally supported.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-02 (Built form) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.147	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-02	Amend	Submitter considers that item 3 of CCZ-PREC-02: "Frames the square" implies that all development in the precinct is adjacent to the square.	Amend CCZ-PREC-02 (Use and development of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct) as follows: Built form The scale, form and positioning of development within the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct: ... 3. Frames the square <u>where situated adjacent to the square</u> ;	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.24	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZPREC01-02	Oppose	The Civic Trust does not agree with this submission. Buildings can still "frame the square" even when they are set back or behind another building (if they are taller).	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.148	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZPREC01-02	Amend	Submitter considers that item 4 of CCZ-PREC-02: "sunlight access within the precinct" should be focused on public spaces, rather than buildings.	Amend CCZ-PREC-02 (Use and development of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct) as follows: Built form The scale, form and positioning of development within the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct: ... 4. <u>Ensures a high degree of sunlight access is achieved within the precinct Ensures a high degree of sunlight access is achieved within public spaces in the precinct</u> ;	Accepted in part	Yes
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.25	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZPREC01-02	Oppose	The Civic Trust does not agree with this submission. Buildings can be part of the public realm – and in this situation the civic function would imply that they are likely to be. In such circumstances sunlight access within a building may be a desirable consideration.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.478	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-03	Support	Considers that Wellington has long prided itself on its walkability, however as of current much of casual navigation around the city centre relies on a harmful culture of jaywalking. It is important that the council is recognising the importance of maintaining current pedestrian linkages whilst acknowledging the need for enhancement.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-03 (Integration with the City Centre, Waterfront and wider transport network) as notified.	Accept.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Civic Trust	388.27	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-03	Support	CCZ-PREC01-03 is generally supported.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-03 (Integration with the City Centre, Waterfront and wider transport network) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.149	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-03	Support	Agrees that Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct is an important pedestrian thoroughfare and pedestrian linkages from surrounding streets and spaces should be retained and improved if possible.	Retain CCZ-PREC-03 (Integration with the City Centre, Waterfront and wider transport network) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.29	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support	Supports the wide range of activities provided for under this policy.	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.57	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support	Considers that community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the current and potential future establishment and operation of a community corrections facility or facilities within these areas in Wellington City.	Retain CCZ-P1.8 (Enabled activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.58	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	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 CCZ-P1.2 (Enabled activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.59	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Amend	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 land use activity rules applying to supported and transitional accommodation activities in the Mixed Use, City Centre and Waterfront zones are amended. The zone frameworks would not otherwise enable supported residential care activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zones, in accordance with the respective default "all other activities" rules (MUZ-R13, CCZ-R16 and WFZ-R11). Supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama, 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. The subject zones include suitable locations for supported and transitional accommodation activities; as they are close to civic amenities and services. This is apparent in that the zones provide for residential activities as permitted, including aligned activities such as visitor accommodation. Supported and transitional accommodation activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in the Mixed Use, City Centre and Waterfront zones. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones, and the effects of such can be managed through the imposition of a restriction on the maximum number of residents (10), as is the case in the residential zones.	Amend CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows, if the definition of "supported residential care activity" is retained: CCZ-P1 Enabled Activities Enable a range and diversity of activities that support the purpose and ongoing viability of the City Centre Zone and enhances its vibrancy and amenity, including: 1. Commercial activities; 2. Residential activities and supported residential care activities, except; a. Along any street subject to active frontage and/or veranda coverage requirements; b. On any site subject to an identified natural hazard risk; ...	Reject.	No.
Stratum Management Limited	249.22	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Amend	Considers that this policy should include residential at ground level to match subsequent provisions, including for example CCZ-P6 (Adaptive use) and CCZ-R12 (Residential activities).	Amend CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: 2. Residential activities, except: a. At ground level along any street... b. At ground level on any site...	Accept.	yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.310	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support	Supports the policy as it promotes the provision of emergency service facilities within the zone. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate stations anywhere within the urban and rural environment.	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
McDonald's	274.56	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support in part	Generally supports the objectives and policies of the City Centre Zone and the enablement of commercial activities	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities), subject to amendments, as outlined other submission points.	Reject.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.180	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.103	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support	CCZ-P1 is supported as it enables a wide-range of activities including commercial activities (as defined).	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Parliamentary Service	375.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support in part	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) with amendment	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Parliamentary Service	375.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-P1 does not provide for the use of the Parliamentary Precinct for parliamentary purpose, as it is not clear which (if any) of the listed activities "parliamentary activities" would fall within. It is therefore submitted that this policy needs to specifically provide for parliamentary activities to occur within the City Centre Zone. It is submitted that a corresponding permitted activity land use rule will also be required, otherwise such activities will be considered Discretionary under CCZ-R16, which is unlikely to have been the intention.	Amend CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable a range and diversity of activities that support the purpose and ongoing viability of the City Centre Zone and enhances its vibrancy and amenity, including: 1. Commercial activities; ... 11. Repair and maintenance service activities; and 12. Recreation activities; <u>and</u> 13. Parliamentary activities.	Accept.	yes
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.99	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.101	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support in part	Supports CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) in principle.	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified. [[Inferred decision requested]]	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.702	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support in part	Supports CCZ-P1 but considers an amendment is required to recognise that residential activities are generally enabled. Considers that Policy CCZ-P2 provides the specifics about activities that should be restricted, noting that this is residential activities at ground floor in areas of identified natural hazard risk. Furthermore, Natural Hazard Area provisions control the location of hazard sensitive activities, such as residential units, within these areas (e.g. NH-R11).	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.703	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Amend	Supports CCZ-P1 but considers an amendment is required to recognise that residential activities are generally enabled. Considers that Policy CCZ-P2 provides the specifics about activities that should be restricted, noting that this is residential activities at ground floor in areas of identified natural hazard risk. Furthermore, Natural Hazard Area provisions control the location of hazard sensitive activities, such as residential units, within these areas (e.g. NH-R11).	Amend CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows: Enable a range and diversity of activities that support the purpose and ongoing viability of the City Centre Zone and enhances its vibrancy and amenity, including: 1. Commercial activities; 2. Residential activities; except: a. Along any street subject to active frontage and/or verandah coverage requirements; b. On any site subject to an identified natural hazard risk; ...	Accept in part.	Yes
Oyster Management Limited	404.53	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P1	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.58	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Support	Supports the discouragement of ground-level car parks in the city centre.	Retain CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified. [[Inferred decision requested]]	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
McDonald's	274.57	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Amend	Opposed to all ground level car parking being considered as a potentially incompatible activity in the City Centre zone. The policy seeks to protect adverse effects on amenity therefore if the car parking is not visible then this policy should not apply. This would be consistent with the other centre zones which do provide such an exclusion.	Seeks that CCZ-P2.3 (Potentially incompatible activities) is amended as follows: ... 3. Carparking at ground level visible at the street edge or public space;	Reject.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.181	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	F523.57	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP2	Oppose	Submission point 349.181 seeks to retain CCZ-P2 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.49 seeks to amend CCZ-P2.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.288	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Oppose in part	Opposes restrictions on retirement villages being established at ground floor level.	Opposes CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.289	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Amend	Opposes restrictions on retirement villages being established at ground floor level.	Seeks to delete clause (5) of CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Woolworths New Zealand	359.84	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Amend	Considers that CCZ-P2 should be amended. The provision as drafted differs to Policy P4 of the LCZ and NCZ and provides some clarity as to why matters 1-5 have been included within the policy (being that they are considered 'potentially incompatible activities'). It is considered unnecessary to incorporate these clauses into Policy CCZ-2. Potentially incompatible activities (being activities not contemplated by the zone, or ones that infringe the zone standards) should be able to be accommodated in the zone if there is a functional and operational need and effects on the Centre are managed.	Amend CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: Only allow activities that are potentially incompatible with the role and function of the City Centre Zone, where they demonstrate an operational or functional need to locate within the zone; or will not have an unacceptable adverse effect on its vitality, vibrancy and amenity. Potentially incompatible activities include: 1. Industrial activities; 2. Yard-based retail activities; 3. Carparking visible at street edge along an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage; 4. Demolition of buildings that results in the creation of vacant land; 5. Ground floor residential activities on street edges identified as having an active frontage or non-residential activity frontage; and 6. Yard-based retail activities.	Reject.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.104	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Support in part	Supports CCZ-P1 for its intent in relation to new activities but considers it is too specific and it will impact on the continued operation, maintenance and upgrade of a range of existing activities. Some yard-based activities, like service stations, play a key role in providing essential services to enable a well-functioning urban environment.	Retain CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.105	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Amend	Considers that CCZ-P2 is too specific and should be amended. CCZ-P2 will impact on the continued operation, maintenance and upgrade of a range of existing activities. Some yard-based activities, like service stations, play a key role in providing essential services to enable a well-functioning urban environment.	Amend CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: Only allow <u>new</u> activities that are potentially incompatible with the purpose of the City Centre Zone, where they will not have an adverse effect on its vitality, vibrancy and amenity. Potentially incompatible activities include: 1. Industrial activities; 2. <u>Some</u> yard-based retail activities; 3. Carparking at ground level; 4. Demolition of buildings that result in the creation of vacant land; and 5. Ground floor residential activities on streets identified as having either an active frontage or verandah coverage and in any identified hazard risk areas.	Reject.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.479	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Amend	The submitter considers that the policy as it currently stands seeks to ensure that abnormal activities performed within the City Centre Zone would not have adverse effect on "Vitality, Vibrancy and amenity". However, the submitter considers that this does not place emphasis on the need to consistently maintain the Wellington City Centres walkability and sustainability in accordance with objectives 3 and 5. The submitter also considers that the policy leaves itself open for activities that could hinder the City Centres public transport network or climate change and Earthquake resilience	Amend CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: Only allow activities that are potentially incompatible with the purpose of the City Centre Zone, where they will not have an adverse effect on its vitality, vibrancy, <u>and</u> amenity, <u>walkability, climate change and earthquake resilience or ease of public transport access and use.</u> Potentially incompatible activities include: 1. Industrial activities; 2. Yard-based retail activities; 3. Carparking at ground level; 4. Demolition of buildings that result in the creation of vacant land; and 5. Ground floor residential activities on streets identified as requiring either an active frontage or verandah coverage and sites subject to an identified hazard risk.	Accept in part.	Yes
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.24	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP2	Support	The listed values are all considered important for the vitality and resilience of the city centre. It is therefore considered appropriate to assess the adverse effects of potentially incompatible activities on these important values.	Allow	Accept in part.	Yes
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.100	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.59	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP2	Oppose	Submission point 383.100 seeks to retain CCZ-P2 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.49 seeks to amend CCZ-P2.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.704	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Support in part	Supports this policy but considers that amendments are required to provide for ground floor residential activities that are not visible from streets and notes that identified hazard risk is addressed in the natural hazards chapter so does not need to be referenced here.	Retain CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.705	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Amend	Supports this policy but considers that amendments are required to provide for ground floor residential activities that are not visible from streets and notes that identified hazard risk is addressed in the natural hazards chapter so does not need to be referenced here.	Amend CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: Only allow activities that are potentially incompatible with the purpose of the City Centre Zone, where they will not have an adverse effect on its vitality, vibrancy and amenity. Potentially incompatible activities include: ... 5. Ground floor residential activities <u>that are visible</u> on streets identified as requiring either an active frontage or verandah coverage <u>and sites subject to an identified hazard risk.</u>	Accept in part.	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Ministry of Education	400.144	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Support	Supports CCZ-P2 as it is important to recognise and provide for educational facilities which will service the surrounding residential catchments and other community/commercial activities.	Retain CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.54	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	F523.58	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP2	Oppose	Submission point 404.54 seeks to retain CCZ-P2 as notified. Submission point 476.49 seeks to amend CCZ-P2.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.150	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Amend	Submitter considers that carparking at ground level should only be a “potentially incompatible activity” where it occurs along building frontages.	Amend CCZ-P2 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: Only allow activities that are potentially incompatible with the purpose of the City Centre Zone, where they will not have an adverse effect on its vitality, vibrancy and amenity. Potentially incompatible activities include: 1. Industrial activities; 2. Yard-based retail activities; 3. Carparking at ground level <u>where it occurs along building frontages</u> ; ...	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	F523.94	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Support	Submission point 416.150 seeks a similar outcome to FSNI submission point 476.49.	Allow / Allow submission in part.	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.49	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P2	Oppose in part	Opposes all ground level car parking being considered as a potentially incompatible activity in the City Centre zone. The policy seeks to protect adverse effects on amenity therefore if the car parking is not visible then this policy should not apply. This would be consistent with the other centre zones which do provide such an exclusion. Retail activities such as supermarkets generally seek to provide on-site customer car parking. This policy, together with the public notification requirement under CCZ-R14.2.a, will act as a significant deterrent to development in City Centre zone.	Amend CCZ-P2.3 (Potentially incompatible activities) as follows: 3. Carparking <u>at ground level visible at the street edge or public space</u> ;	Reject.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	F584.101	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP2	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose this submission point. A “discretionary” activity status provides necessary controls for carparking activities which align with the direction of Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3 and CC.9	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions be retained as notified and support provisions that support active transport nodes.	Reject.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.182	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P3	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P3 (Heavy industrial activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.106	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P3	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CCZ-P3 (Heavy industrial activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.101	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P3	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P3 (Heavy industrial activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.706	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P3	Support	Supports CCZ-P3.	Retain CCZ-P3 (Heavy industrial activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.55	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P3	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P3 (Heavy industrial activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Paul Burnaby	44.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P4	Support	With the confirmation of the provisions supports and the requested changes, the District Plan provisions will more closely align with and implement the directive policies under the NNPS-UD, in particular Policy 3(a) which requires that district plans enable “in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification”	Retain CCZ-P4 (Housing choice) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Stratum Management Limited	249.23	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P4	Support	Considers that the policy appropriately seeks to enable high density residential development in the zone.	Retain CCZ-P4 (Housing choice) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P4	Amend	Considers that replacing the term ‘abilities’ with ‘impairments’ in CCZ-P4 is more appropriate. Notes that using the term ‘abilities’ to refer to disabled people is regarded as euphemistic by many within the disabled community.	Amend CCZ-P4 (Housing choice) as follows: Enable high density, good quality residential development that: 1. Contributes towards accommodating anticipated growth in the city; and 2. Offers a range of housing price, type, size and tenure that is accessible to people of all ages, lifestyles, cultures and <u>abilities-impairments</u> . [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part.	yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.183	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P4	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P4 (Housing choice) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.290	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P4	Support	Generally supports CCZ-P4 and its enabling of high density, good quality residential development. However, it is necessary to acknowledge that each individual development will not offer a range in those matters listed in (2).	Retain CCZ-P4 (Housing choice) with amendment to read “Offers Contributes to a range of housing price, type, size and tenure...”	Accept.	yes
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.291	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P4	Amend	Generally supports CCZ-P4 and its enabling of high density, good quality residential development. However, it is necessary to acknowledge that each individual development will not offer a range in those matters listed in (2).	Retain CCZ-P4 (Housing choice) with amendment to read “Offers Contributes to a range of housing price, type, size and tenure...”	Accept.	yes
Z Energy Limited	361.107	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CCZ-P4 (Housing choice) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.102	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P4	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P4 (Housing choice) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.707	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P4	Support in part	Support this policy but seeks amendment to recognise that tenures should not be managed through the District Plan. Considers the focus should be on providing for the level of the activity and building form that is appropriate for a City Centre.	Retain CCZ-P4 (Housing Choice) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.708	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P4	Amend	Support this policy but seeks amendment to recognise that tenures should not be managed through the District Plan. Considers the focus should be on providing for the level of the activity and building form that is appropriate for a City Centre.	Amend CCZ-P4 (Housing Choice) as follows: Housing choice Enable high density, good quality residential development that: 1. Contributes towards accommodating anticipated growth in the city; and 2. Offers a range of housing price, type, <u>and size and tenure</u> that is accessible to people of all ages, lifestyles, cultures and abilities	Reject.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.56	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P4	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P4 (Housing choice) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.151	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P4	Support	Supports offering a range of housing price, type, size and tenure.	Retain CCZ-P4 (Housing choice) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Paul Burnaby	44.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P5	Support	With the confirmation of the provisions supports and the requested changes, the District Plan provisions will more closely align with and implement the directive policies under the NNPS-UD, in particular Policy 3(a) which requires that district plans enable "in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification"	Retain CCZ-P5 (Urban form and scale) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.30	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P5	Support	Supports CCZ-P5 as it recognises the benefits of intensification, enables greater heights, and recognises the need for land to be efficiently optimised.	Retain CCZ-P5 (Urban form and scale) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Stratum Management Limited	249.24	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P5	Support	Considers that the policy appropriately recognises the benefits of intensification in the City Centre zone.	Retain CCZ-P5 (Urban form and scale) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.184	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P5	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P5 (Urban form and scale) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.292	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P5	Support	Supports CCZ-P5 and its recognition of the benefits of intensification by enabling greater height and scale of development, and the efficient optimisation of the development capacity of land.	Retain CCZ-P5 (Urban form and scale) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.108	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CCZ-P5 (Urban form and scale) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.103	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P5	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P5 (Urban form and scale) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.709	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P5	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain CCZ-P5 (Urban form and scale) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.57	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P5	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P5 (Urban form and scale) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.152	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P5	Support	Support allowing greater overall height and scale within the city centre.	Retain CCZ-P5 (Urban form and scale) as notified.	Accept.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.185	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P6	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P6 (Adaptive use) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.109	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P6	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CCZ-P6 (Adaptive use) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.104	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P6	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P6 (Adaptive use) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.710	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P6	Support in part	Supports adaptive use within the CCZ but seeks amendments that recognise that ground floor residential activities may be appropriate where they are located at ground floor level but not fronting active streets. Considers not all hazards would restrict residential activities from locating at ground floor. For example - earthquake risk is likely to be just as high at ground floor as it is on other floors. In addition, considers the Natural Hazards chapter manages this issue.	Retain CCZ-P6 (Adaptive use) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.711	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P6	Amend	Supports adaptive use within the CCZ but seeks amendments that recognise that ground floor residential activities may be appropriate where they are located at ground floor level but not fronting active streets. Considers not all hazards would restrict residential activities from locating at ground floor. For example - earthquake risk is likely to be just as high at ground floor as it is on other floors. In addition, considers the Natural Hazards chapter manages this issue.	Amend CCZ-P6 (Adaptive use) as follows: Adaptive use Encourage new development and redevelopment in the City Centre Zone that is sustainable, resilient and adaptable to change in use over time, including enabling: 1. Sufficient flexibility for ground floor space to be used and converted for a range of activities; and 2. Residential activities at ground floor level along fronting streets that are not subject to active frontage and/or verandah coverage requirements and sites free of any identified natural hazard risk.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Oyster Management Limited	404.58	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P6	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P6 (Adaptive use) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.153	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P6	Oppose	Submitter considers that while adaptive reuse is generally encouraged, it is already effectively controlled through: - market mechanisms (developers and property owners naturally wish to increase flexibility of their buildings); and - sustainability requirements and rating tools, which reward reuse.	Delete CCZ-P6 (Adaptive use) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.186	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P7	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P7 (Ahi Kā) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P7	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CCZ-P7 (Ahi Kā) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.105	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P7	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P7 (Ahi Kā) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.102	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P7	Support in part	Supports CCZ-P7 (Ahi Kā) in principle.	Retain CCZ-P7 (Ahi Kā) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.712	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P7	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain CCZ-P7 (Ahi Kā) as notified	Accept.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.59	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P7	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P7 (Ahi Kā) as notified.	Accept.	No.
VictLabour	414.43	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P7	Support	Supportive of ahi ka provisions, particularly papakainga housing and consider that mana whenua should lead this.	Retain CCZ-P7 (Ahi Kā) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept.	No.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	488.82	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P7	Support in part	Supports reference to papakainga.	Retain CCZ-P7 (Ahi Kā) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Paul Burnaby	44.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P8	Support	With the confirmation of the provisions supports and the requested changes, the District Plan provisions will more closely align with and implement the directive policies under the NNPS-UD, in particular Policy 3(a) which requires that district plans enable "in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification"	Retain CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P8	Support	Supports policy CCZ-P8, particularly requirement to encourage diversity of accessible, well designed civic and public space as this will enable greater accessibility and mobilisation by everyone, including disabled people.	Retain CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.187	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P8	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.111	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P8	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.106	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P8	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.103	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P8	Support in part	Supports CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) in principle.	Retain CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.713	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P8	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P8	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.154	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P8	Support	Support reinforcing the city centre's diversified and vibrant mix of activities and visually prominent buildings and variety of architectural styles. The District Plan should not shy away from permitting quality development at scale.	Retain CCZ-P8 (Sense of place) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Paul Burnaby	44.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support	Supports the recognition of the benefits of well-designed, comprehensive development, as well as the providing for increased levels of residential accommodation anticipated.	Retain CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.311	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to achieve quality design outcomes for new development in the zone. In order to achieve good quality design outcomes, which includes the provision of a safe environment and resilient urban environment, FENZ considers it critical that access for emergency service vehicles is a consideration of the design and layout of new developments. FENZ therefore seeks the inclusion of a further matter under this policy.	Supports CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) with amendment.	Accept.	Yes.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.312	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Amend	Supports the policy as it seeks to achieve quality design outcomes for new development in the zone. In order to achieve good quality design outcomes, which includes the provision of a safe environment and resilient urban environment, FENZ considers it critical that access for emergency service vehicles is a consideration of the design and layout of new developments. FENZ therefore seeks the inclusion of a further matter under this policy.	Amend CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as follows: Require new development, and alterations and additions to existing development at a site scale, to positively contribute to the sense of place, quality and amenity of City Centre Zone by: 1. Recognising the benefits of well-designed, comprehensive, development, including the extent to which the development: ... c. Provides for the increased levels of residential accommodation anticipated; and d. Provides for a range of supporting business, open space and community facilities; and e. Is accessible for emergency service vehicles; and	Accept.	Yes.
McDonald's	274.58	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support in part	Whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Retain CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes), subject to amendments as outlined other submission points.	Reject.	No.
McDonald's	274.59	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Amend	Whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Seeks addition of the following to CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as follows: Recognise the functional and operational requirements of activities and development.	Reject.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.188	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.60	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP9	Oppose	Submission point 349.188 seeks to retain CCZ-P9 as notified. FSNI submission points 476.50 & 476.51 seek to amend CCZ-P9.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.293	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support in part	Supports the recognition in (1)(b) of optimising the development capacity of land and in (2)(e) of flexibility for ground floor space to be used for residential purposes.	Retain CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.112	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support in part	CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) is supported as it seeks that development, and additions and alterations to existing development, positively contributes to the sense of place and distinctive form, quality and amenity through a range of intended design outcomes.	Retain CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcome) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.113	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Amend	Considers that CCZ-P9 should also recognise that alternative design responses are necessary for functional requirements of a range of activities, including existing service stations.	Amend CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcome) as follows: ... 2. Ensuring that development, where relevant: ... f. Integrates with existing and planned active and public transport activity movement networks, including planned rapid transit stops; and g. Allows sufficient flexibility for ground floor space to be converted to a range of activities, including residential along streets that are not subject to active frontage and/or verandah coverage requirements and sites free of any identified natural hazard risk. h. <u>Recognises that alternative design responses are necessary for functional</u> requirements of a range of activities, including existing service stations.	Reject.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.107	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.62	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP9	Oppose	Submission point 383.107 seeks to retain CCZ-P9 as notified. FSNI submission points 476.50 & 476.51 seek to amend CCZ-P9.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.	Reject.	No.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.104	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support in part	Supports CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) in principle.	Retain CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.714	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support in part	Generally supports this policy, but seeks amendment to: (a) The policy name to better reflect the intent of the policy and the subsequent wording, which seeks to manage new developments contribution to the city centre and streetscape; and (b) The policy wording to better recognise the CCZ rule setting and 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; and to simplify and clarify the neighbourhood and townscape outcomes that plan is seeking to manage.	Retain CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) and seeks amendments.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.715	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Amend	Generally supports this policy, but seeks amendment to: (a) The policy name to better reflect the intent of the policy and the subsequent wording, which seeks to manage new developments contribution to the city centre and streetscape; and (b) The policy wording to better recognise the CCZ rule setting and 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; and to simplify and clarify the neighbourhood and townscape outcomes that plan is seeking to manage.	Amend CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as follows: Quality design City Centre <u>Quality design City Centre</u> outcomes Require significant new development, and alterations and additions to existing development, at a site scale to positively contribute to the sense of place and distinctive form, quality and amenity <u>amenity planned urban built form and function</u> of the City Centre Zone by: 1. Recognising the benefits of well-designed, comprehensive intensive development, including the extent to which the development: a. Acts as a catalyst for future change by reflecting <u>Reflects</u> the nature and scale of the development proposed <u>enabled</u> within the zone and in the vicinity and responds to the evolving, more intensive identity of the neighbourhood <u>City Centre</u> ; b. Optimises the development capacity of the land, particularly sites that are: <u>are:</u> i. Large; or ii. Narrow; or iii. Vacant; or iv. Ground-level parking areas; ... 2. Ensuring that development, where relevant: a. Responds to the site context, particularly where it is located adjacent to: i. A scheduled site of significance to Māori; ii. A heritage building, heritage structure or heritage area; iii. An identified character overlay <u>precinct</u> ; ... g. Allows sufficient flexibility for ground floor space to be converted to a range of activities, including residential along streets that are not subject to active frontage and/or verandah coverage requirements and sites free of any identified natural hazard risk.	Accept in part.	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.129	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP9	Oppose	Considers the intended policy direction of listing sites with development capacity is helpful and appropriate.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
LIVE WELLington	F596.39	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP9	Oppose	We oppose the amendment to CCZ-P9 to remove references in (1)(b) to large, narrow, vacant or ground level parking sites. The intended policy direction by listing sites with development capacity is helpful and appropriate.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	F5103.25	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP9	Support	The recommended amendment is considered to provide clearer guidance regarding expectations around built form of larger projects.	Allow	Accept in part.	Yes.
Roland Sapsford	F5117.38	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP9	Oppose	Roland Sapsford opposes the amendment to CCZ-P9 to remove references in (1)(b) to large, narrow, vacant or ground level parking sites. The intended policy direction by listing sites with development capacity is helpful and appropriate.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.61	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	F523.61	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP9	Oppose	Submission point 404.61 seeks to retain CCZ-P9 as notified. FSNI submission points 476.50 & 476.51 seek to amend CCZ-P9.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Heritage Professionals	412.81	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support	Supports this policy to ensure that development responds to site context, where it is located adjacent to a site of significance to Māori, heritage place or character precinct.	Retain CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.155	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support in part	Supports CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) in part.	Not specified.	Accept in part.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.156	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Amend	The submitter considers that this is a long (and confusing) provision and should be reviewed against the earlier policies to ensure it is succinct, focused and does not cover the same ground as other policies. If the Design Guides are retained (which the submitter opposes), the submitter considers that this policy should be reviewed for overlap with the Design Guides.	Seeks that CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) be amended to ensure it is succinct, focused and does not cover the same ground as other policies.	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.95	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support	Submission point 416.156 seeks a similar outcome to FSNI submission points 476.50 & 476.51.	Allow / Allow submission in part.	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.157	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Amend	The submitter considers that this is a long (and confusing) provision and should be reviewed against the earlier policies to ensure it is succinct, focused and does not cover the same ground as other policies. If the Design Guides are retained (which the submitter opposes), the submitter considers that this policy should be reviewed for overlap with the Design Guides.	Seeks that if the Design Guides are retained that CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) be reviewed for overlap with the Design Guides.	Accept in part.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.96	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support	Submission point 416.157 seeks a similar outcome to FSNI submission points 476.50 & 476.51.	Allow / Allow submission in part.	Accept in part.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.50	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Support in part	Considers that whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Retain CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.51	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P9	Amend	Considers that whilst functional and operational needs are referred to within some assessment criteria, there is no correlation to any policies.	Amend CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) to include the following: Recognise the functional and operational requirements of activities and development.	Reject.	No.
Paul Burnaby	44.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Support	With the confirmation of the provisions supports and the requested changes, the District Plan provisions will more closely align with and implement the directive policies under the NNPS-UD, in particular Policy 3(a) which requires that district plans enable "in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification"	Retain CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Stratum Management Limited	249.25	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Amend	Opposes CCZ-S10 (Residential - outdoor living space) relating to outdoor living spaces. As a result, Stratum seeks an amendment to CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) by deleting point (2) of CCZP10.	Amend CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) as follows: Achieve a high standard of amenity for residential activities that reflects and responds to the evolving, higher density scale of development anticipated in the City Centre Zone, including: 1. Providing residents with access to an adequate outlook; and 2. Ensuring access to convenient outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas.	Reject.	Yes
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.189	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.114	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.108	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.716	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Support in part	Supports this policy in part subject to amendments to relevant rules being made to clarify the extent of on-site amenity requirements. Amendments to remove communal outdoor space requirements are also sought as it is considered this is already covered by reference to outdoor space generally and this could be private outdoor space.	Retain CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part.	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.717	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Amend	Supports this policy in part subject to amendments to relevant rules being made to clarify the extent of on-site amenity requirements. Amendments to remove communal outdoor space requirements are also sought as it is considered this is already covered by reference to outdoor space generally and this could be private outdoor space.	Amend CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) as follows: Ensuring access to convenient outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas.	Accept in part.	Yes
Oyster Management Limited	404.62	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.168	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP10	Support	Considers reference in CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) to "adequate outlook" and "convenient outdoor space" is necessary and important for residential wellbeing in high density environments.	Allow	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.158	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P10	Amend	Submitter considers that on-site residential amenity can be provided in a number of ways and should not be prescriptive, acknowledging that mandated types of amenity (such as outdoor space) can increase housing cost and prevent lower income residents living within the city centre. Submitter considers that the policy should acknowledge affordability constraints. The National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) requires district plans to “enable, in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible” (Policy 3). Submitter considers that this should not be restricted by prescriptive amenity requirements.	Amend CCZ-P10 (On-site residential amenity) as follows: Achieve a high standard of amenity for residential activities that reflects and responds to the evolving, higher density scale of development anticipated in the City Centre Zone and the need to provide for a choice of building type, size, affordability and distribution, including: 1. Providing residents with access to an adequate outlook; and 2. Ensuring access to convenient outdoor space, including private or shared communal areas.	Reject.	No.
Paul Burnaby	44.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Support	With the confirmation of the provisions supports and the requested changes, the District Plan provisions will more closely align with and implement the directive policies under the NNPS-UD, in particular Policy 3(a) which requires that district plans enable “in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification”	Retain CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as notified.	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.31	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Opposes CCZ-P11 as this refers to the City Outcomes Contribution.	Delete CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contributions)	Accept – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.34	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Support	Supports the introduction of the ‘City Outcomes Contribution’ mechanism, ensuring larger commercial, residential and mixed use developments will become more publicly beneficial for everyone.	Retain CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as notified.	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Stratum Management Limited	249.26	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Amend	Considers that the introductory text to this policy requires clarification that it applies to over height and under height buildings and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building. As currently worded, the policy application is unclear. Equivalent changes may be required elsewhere within the chapter or in other chapters to ensure consistency of wording.	Seeks to amend CCZ-P11 (City Outcomes Contribution) to clarify its intent in accordance with the third matter of discretion under Rule CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures)	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
McDonald’s	274.60	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	McDonald’s is opposed to the ‘City Outcomes Contributions’ provisions and considers that developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their merits and effects. The merits of a proposal should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Seeks that CCZ-P11 (City Outcomes Contributions) is deleted.	Accept – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Property Council New Zealand	338.18	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Amend	Considers that incentives for large developments that can demonstrate a City Outcomes Contribution (such as priority consenting) would establish a quid pro quo system and enable growth rather than placing additional obstacles for large-scale development to occur.	Seeks that incentives be provided to encourage but not require large developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.208	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA’s primary submission.	Disallow	Accept in part	yes.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.208	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission.	Disallow	Accept in part	yes.
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Amend	Considers that CCZ-P11 should also make reference to disabled people by adding the term ‘disability’.	Amend CCZ-P11(5) (City outcomes contribution) as follows: Require over and under height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development in the City Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107, including through either: ... 5. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility/ <u>disability</u> . [Inferred decision requested]	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.19	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Oppose The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide (and the associated policy and matters of discretion linkages), do not recognise or provide for the functional or operational requirements of activities. The Design Guide reads as a set of rules to be complied with, rather than guidelines to inform the assessment of applications for resource consent and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process. The Design Guide places unreasonable requirements on applicants on matters that are more appropriately dealt with at a national level (for example, reducing travel/shipping costs of materials to reduce carbon emissions, and installing insulation above minimum requirements). The imposition of “thresholds” for certain types of development result in a “pass/fail” assessment being applied and will result in an unnecessarily onerous and unreasonable resource consent process.	Amend CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as follows: Require over height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development in the City Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107, including through either: 1. Positively contributing to public space provision and the amenity of the site and surrounding area; and/or 2. Incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience; and/or 3. Incorporating construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs; and/or 4. Incorporating assisted housing into the development; where this is provided, legal instruments are required to ensure that it remains assisted housing for at least 25 years; and/or 5. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.63	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP11	Oppose	Submission point 349.190 seeks to amend CCZ-P11. FSNI submission point 476.52 seeks to delete CCZ-P11 in its entirety.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.	Accept in part.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.294	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of the City Outcomes Contribution requirements of CCZ-P11 and considers that any requirements associated with developments that are under or over height should directly relate to mitigation of potential or actual effects. The policy would create barriers that strongly conflict with the need to resolve the housing crisis and address the needs of the rapidly growing aging population.	Delete CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) in its entirety as notified.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.85	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Amend	Considers that CCZ-P11 is unclear and should be amended. The provision contains an incorrect reference to the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide document (should be G97 as opposed to G107). A review of the guideline indicates that G97 City Outcomes Contribution is only triggered for City Centre zone developments where they are under or over height development comprising 50 or more units or any comprehensive development). As such, the Policy as currently drafted implies that any non-residential development in the CCZ is subject to this policy which is incorrect. The above amendment seeks to align this Policy with the Guide document.	Amend CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as follows: Require over and under height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development under or over height development comprising 50 or more units or any under or over height comprehensive development in the City Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G97G107 , including through either:	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.22	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Submission point 359.85 seeks to amend CCZ-P11. FSNI submission point 476.52 seeks to delete CCZ-P11 in its entirety.	Disallow / Disallow this submission in part.	Accept in part.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.115	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Support in part	Supports CCZ-P11 (City Outcomes Contribution) which seeks to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107.	Retain CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) with amendment.	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Z Energy Limited	361.116	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Amend	Considers that CCZ-P11 should also recognise the existing environment and the functional requirements of a range of existing activities.	Amend CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as follows: Require over and under height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive development in the City Centre Zone to deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide guideline G107, <u>while recognising the existing environment</u> , including through either:	Reject.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.109	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Opposes this policy which requires some developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions in accordance with the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide. This is because: - This provision elevates what is normally a design guide into a rule. A design guide should be separate to a plan. The Design Guide should be an external document to the District Plan and be referenced as a guide only. - Further, this provision, provides a mechanism for the Council to require these aspects as part of a development. This is inappropriate. A development should be assessed on its merits.	Delete Policy CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution).	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.65	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP11	Support	Submission point 404.63 supports FSNI submission point 476.52.	Allow	Accept in part	No.
McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited	FS45.6	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP11	Support	McDonald's Restaurants New Zealand Limited supports these submissions seeking deletion of the City Outcomes Contributions. While MRNZL recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Allow	Accept in part	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.718	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose in part	Opposes requiring 'City Outcomes Contribution' for development for the following reasons: a. Considers it is inconsistent with the current legislative framework; b. Considers over height development should be assessed based on the potential or actual effects or the proposed infringement, as provided for by the rule framework; and c. Considers all of these activities are anticipated by the zone, and this policy has the potential to disincentivise intensified development. Seeks amendments to the policy to instead encourage positive outcomes for development in the HRZ	Retain CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) and seeks amendment	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.162	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP11	Not specified	The RVA supports in part the relief sought in this submission where it aligns with The RVA's primary submission to have these references removed, however, The RVA seeks for this provision to be deleted in full.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA's primary submission.	Reject	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.162	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP11	Not specified	Ryman supports in part the relief sought in this submission where it aligns with Ryman's primary submission to have these references removed, however, Ryman seeks for this provision to be deleted in full.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman's primary submission.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.719	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Amend	Opposes requiring 'City Outcomes Contribution' for development for the following reasons: a. Considers it is inconsistent with the current legislative framework; b. Considers over height development should be assessed based on the potential or actual effects or the proposed infringement, as provided for by the rule framework; and c. Considers all of these activities are anticipated by the zone, and this policy has the potential to disincentivise intensified development. Seeks amendments to the policy to instead encourage positive outcomes for development in the HRZ	Amend CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as follows: City Outcomes Contribution Require over height, large-scale residential, non-residential and comprehensive Encourage development in the City Centre Zone to contribute to positive outcomes deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guideline G107, including through either: 1. Positively contributing to public space provision and the amenity of the site and surrounding area; and/or 2. Incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience; and/or 3. Incorporating construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs; and/or 4. Incorporating assisted housing into the development, and where this is provided legal instruments are required to ensure that it remains assisted housing for at least 25 years; and/or 5. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility.	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Oyster Management Limited	404.63	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as notified.	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Foodstuffs North Island	F523.64	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP11	Oppose	Submission point 404.63 seeks to retain CCZ-P11 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.52 seeks to delete CCZ-P11 in its entirety.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.	Accept	No.
Investore Property Limited	405.131	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Considers that the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions are inappropriate. Specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development which he submitter considers is inappropriate. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]	Seeks that CCZ-P11 (City Outcomes Contribution) is deleted in its entirety as notified.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
VictLabour	414.44	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Support in part	Supportive of the inclusion of a points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits (the city outcomes contribution mechanism) but considers it an example of how arbitrary and excessive many of these regulations are, particularly around height and character protections.	Seeks to retain points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.159	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Support in part	Supports CCZ-P11 in part. While generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, the submitter considers there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc). Submitter considers that as currently drafted, the initiative remains "subject to" numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions. Submitter considers that CCZ-P11 is also phrased to "require" City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes.	Retain CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution), with amendments.	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Foodstuffs North Island	F523.97	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Submission point 416.159 seeks to retain CCZ-P11 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.52 seeks to delete CCZ-P11.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.160	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Amend	Supports CCZ-P11 in part. While generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, the submitter considers there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc). Submitter considers that as currently drafted, the initiative remains "subject to" numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions. Submitter considers that CCZ-P11 is also phrased to "require" City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes. If height limits are removed (see comments on CCZ-S1), the City Outcomes Contribution will need to be deleted and/or redefined to relate to additional floor area (or an appropriate metric as required).	Delete CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) if height limits are also deleted.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Foodstuffs North Island	F523.98	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Submission point 416.160 seeks to retain CCZ-P11 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.52 seeks to delete CCZ-P11.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.161	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Amend	<p>Supports CCZ-P11 in part. While generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, the submitter considers there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc). Submitter considers that as currently drafted, the initiative remains “subject to” numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions.</p> <p>Submitter considers that CCZ-P11 is also phrased to “require” City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes.</p> <p>If height limits are removed (see comments on CCZ-S1), the City Outcomes Contribution will need to be deleted and/or redefined to relate to additional floor area (or an appropriate metric as required).</p>	Seeks that CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) be amended if floor area ratios are used instead of height standards. Amend to allow greater additional floor area (or an appropriate metric as required) if the relevant outcomes are achieved.	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.99	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Submission point 416.161 seeks to retain CCZ-P11 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.52 seeks to delete CCZ-P11.	Disallow	Accept	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.162	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Amend	<p>Supports CCZ-P11 in part. While generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, the submitter considers there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc). Submitter considers that as currently drafted, the initiative remains “subject to” numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions.</p> <p>Submitter considers that CCZ-P11 is also phrased to “require” City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes.</p> <p>If height limits are removed (see comments on CCZ-S1), the City Outcomes Contribution will need to be deleted and/or redefined to relate to additional floor area (or an appropriate metric as required).</p>	Seeks that if CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) is retained, it should be re-phrased so that, rather than “Require over and under height” developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions, the height limit for developments is varied where City Outcomes Contributions are achieved. The change of phrasing reflects the possibility that, as currently proposed, over and under height developments still have a theoretical pathway to obtain a restricted discretionary consent without achieving City Outcomes Contributions. It would also make it clearer that the developer providing the outcome is entitled to the increase in height (or floor area).	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.100	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	Submission point 416.162 seeks to retain CCZ-P11 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.52 seeks to delete CCZ-P11.	Disallow	Accept	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.57	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	<p>Opposed to the ‘City Outcomes Contributions’ provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring ‘City Outcomes Contributions’ for ‘over height’ development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>The ‘City Outcomes Contributions’ have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of “density done well” as stated in the Design Guide.</p> <p>Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.</p>	Delete CCZ-P11 (City Outcomes Contribution) in its entirety.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Fabric Property Limited	425.58	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	[See original submission for further detail, outlined in previous submission point]	Delete CCZ-P11 (City Outcomes Contribution) in its entirety.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Reading Wellington Properties Limited	441.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Support	Considers that CCZ-P11 provides appropriate guidance on what buildings heights that are outside of the permitted parameters need to achieve.	Retain CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as notified.	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Foodstuffs North Island	476.52	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P11	Oppose	<p>Opposes CCZ-P11</p> <p>Specifically opposes requiring contributions for development in the City Centre zone that is below the minimum height limit.</p> <p>While FSNI recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to noncompliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the PDP strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing for development capacity and urban intensification.</p>	Delete CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) and consequential references in their entirety.	Accept in part – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Stratum Management Limited	249.27	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Amend	<p>Considers that the policy seeks to recognise the “evolving, higher density development context anticipated in the City Centre Zone...” which is supported.</p> <p>It then seeks to manage any associated adverse effects including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impacts of building dominance and the height and scale relationship; • Building mass effects, including the amount of light and outlook around buildings. <p>Considers that the policy can be read as being potentially inconsistent with Policy CCZ-P5 (Urban form and scale).</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as follows:</p> <p>Recognise the evolving, higher density development context anticipated in the City Centre Zone, while managing any associated adverse effects including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The impacts of building dominance and the height and scale relationship <u>where a building does not meet relevant standards; and</u> 2. Building mass effects, including the amount of light and outlook around buildings <u>where a building does not meet relevant standards; and</u> 3. The impacts on sunlight access to identified public space; and 4. The impacts of related construction activity on the transport network. 	Reject.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.313	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Support in part	Supports the policy as it seeks to manage any adverse effects associated with higher density development anticipated in this zone. In order to manage the full range of adverse effects, which includes consideration of fire safety in high density urban environments, FENZ considers it critical that access for emergency service vehicles is a consideration of the design and layout of new high density developments. FENZ therefore seeks the inclusion of a further matter under this policy	Supports CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects), with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.314	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Amend	<p>Supports the policy as it seeks to manage any adverse effects associated with higher density development anticipated in this zone. In order to manage the full range of adverse effects, which includes consideration of fire safety in high density urban environments, FENZ considers it critical that access for emergency service vehicles is a consideration of the design and layout of new high density developments. FENZ therefore seeks the inclusion of a further matter under this policy</p> <p>Note: Submitter refers to CCZ-P13, which is an error.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as follows:</p> <p>Recognise the evolving, higher density development context anticipated in the City Centre Zone, while managing any associated adverse effects including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The impacts of building dominance and the height and scale relationship; 2. Building mass effects, including the amount of light and outlook around buildings; and 3. The impacts on sunlight access to identified public space; and 4. The impacts of related construction activity on the transport network; and 5. Accessibility for emergency service vehicles. 	Reject.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.191	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.117	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.48	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Amend	The submitter considers that the policy fails to mention the impact of the development process on any of the Wellington Central City Zones sustainability goals. Whilst the submitter notes that the protection of the public transport network is important, The submitter suggests the addition of 1 new and amendment of 1 point in order to ensure the policy correctly upholds the ideals and vision held within the preamble and Objectives 3 and 5.	<p>Amend CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as follows:</p> <p>Recognise the evolving, higher density development context anticipated in the City Centre Zone, while managing any associated adverse effects including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The impacts of building dominance and the height and scale relationship <u>2. The emission of greenhouse gases and waste water runoff from construction.</u> 3. Building mass effects, including the amount of light and outlook around buildings; and 4. The impacts on sunlight access to identified public space; and 5. The impacts of related construction activity on the transport network <u>and pedestrian linkages.</u> 	Accept in part.	Yes
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.110	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Support	Generally supports the policies of the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.720	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Support in part	Supports policy subject to amendments that reflect NPSUD Policy 6.	Retain CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.721	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Amend	Supports policy subject to amendments that reflect NPSUD Policy 6.	Amend CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: Recognise the evolving, higher density development context anticipated in the City Centre Zone, while managing any associated adverse effects <u>beyond those anticipated within the zone</u> including: ...	Reject.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.64	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Support	Supports the City Centre Zone policies.	Retain CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	Yes
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.163	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-P12	Amend	Submitter considers that the impacts of construction activity on the transport network should not be relevant in the resource consenting process. Submitter considers densification proposed by the District Plan will inevitably result in impacts.	Amend CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: Recognise the evolving, higher density development context anticipated in the City Centre Zone, while managing any associated adverse effects including: ... 4. The impacts of related construction activity on the transport network.	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.26	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZP12	Oppose	As proposed, the impact on the transport network is an effect to be managed. Given the role and function of the zone, high traffic volumes are expected but works within the road corridor can cause serious delays on a network where there are high traffic volumes. The policy as drafted (appropriately) allows for the careful consideration of how construction could be provided for in a manner that reduces the impact on road users in the zone. Retain as drafted.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.28	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P1	Support	CCZ-PREC01-P1 is generally supported.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-P1 (Activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.164	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P1	Support	Submitter agrees a range of activities should be supported within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-P1 (Activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.29	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P2	Support in part	CCZ-PREC01-P2 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-P2 (Use and development of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct) with amendment.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Civic Trust	388.30	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P2	Amend	Considers that CCZ-PREC01-P2 should be amended to clarify wording. Wording in portrays the precinct as redevelopment area. The findings of a seminar run by the Civic Trust in 2021 were that people seek to retain as much as possible of the existing buildings, structures and spaces for reuse, rather than demolition and replacement buildings. It is sought that this is reflected in the provision.	Amend CCZ-PREC01-P2 (Use and development of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct) as follows: Provide for the staged redevelopment of managed change in the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct, and its connections with the transport network, wider City Centre Zone and Waterfront Zone, including: 1. Enhancing the public function, pedestrian network and public spaces within the precinct; 2. Maintaining its special character by managing the form, scale and intensity of development; 3. Ensuring land use activities and <u>any new</u> development are planned and designed in a coordinated, site-responsive, comprehensive and integrated manner; and 4. Enabling new development and a range of activities that are integrated and compatible with existing buildings and land uses in the precinct.	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.165	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P2	Amend	Submitter considers that item 3 may result in a perverse situation where development is delayed while other potential development areas of Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct are being considered.	Amend CCZ-PREC01-P2 (Use and development of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct) as follows: Provide for the staged redevelopment of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct, and its connections with the transport network, wider City Centre Zone and Waterfront Zone, including: 1. Enhancing the public function, pedestrian network and public spaces within the precinct; 2. Maintaining its special character by managing the form, scale and intensity of development; 3. Ensuring land use activities and development are planned and designed in a co-ordinated, siteresponsive, comprehensive and integrated manner <u>to the extent reasonable while allowing for development to progress in a natural manner</u> ; and 4. Enabling new development and a range of activities that are integrated and compatible with existing buildings and land uses in the precinct.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	F583.26	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P2	Oppose	This submission cuts across a submission of the Civic Trust. The Trust does not see the Te Ngākau Square Precinct as a giant redevelopment site. Our request is for policy recognition of the need for careful management of any change in the precinct. There is nothing "natural" in redevelopment although that is how the submission suggests it should be portrayed. The Civic Trust seek that its submission is allowed, and this one disallowed.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.31	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P3	Support in part	CCZ-PREC01-P3 is generally supported, but an amendment is sought.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-P3 (Access, connections and open space) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.32	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-PREC01-P3 should be amended to clearly state that the Precinct must be kept free of vehicular traffic.	Amend CCZ-PREC01-P3 (Access, connections and open space) as follows: Require that the use and development of the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct: ... 3. Provides well-designed, safe and accessible public and green open space, within the precinct. 4. <u>Avoids vehicle access at surface level with the precinct.</u>	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.166	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P3	Support	Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct provides an important central connection hub.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-P3 (Access, connections and open space) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.33	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P4	Support	CCZ-PREC01-P4 is generally supported.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-P4 (Amenity and design) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.105	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P4	Support in part	Supports CCZ-PREC01-P4 (Amenity and design) in principle.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-P4 (Amenity and design) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.167	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-P4	Support	The requirements stated reflect the importance of quality development within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-P4 (Amenity and design) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.32	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.192	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Foodstuffs North Island	F523.78	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR1	Support	Submission point 349.192 supports FSNI submission point 476.100.	Allow	Accept.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.118	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Supports Rule CCZ-R1 (Commercial Activities) which provides for commercial activities (as defined) as a permitted activity with no limitation as to the land use activity. It is understood that any new building or structure to be erected on would still need to comply with the applicable permitted activity performance standards under Standards CCZ-S1 -S13, or require consent as a restricted discretionary activity where those standards cannot be met.	Retain CCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.111	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Supports commercial activities, including offices and retail activities, being permitted in the City Centre zone. This is appropriate to enable the continued vibrancy of the city centre.	Retain CCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	F523.80	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR1	Support	Submission point 383.111 supports FSNI submission point 476.100.	Allow	Accept.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.65	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Supports commercial activities being Permitted in the City Centre Zone to ensure continued vibrancy of the city.	Retain CCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	F523.79	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR1	Support	Submission point 404.65 supports FSNI submission point 476.100.	Allow	Accept.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.59	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Supports the commercial activities being permitted in the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-R1 (Commercial Activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.100	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R1	Support	Supports supermarkets as a permitted activity in the CCZ.	Retain CCZ-R1 (Commercial activities) as notified. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.33	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R2	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R2 (Community facilities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R2	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R2 (Community facilities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.34	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R3	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R3 (Educational facilities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R3	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R3 (Educational facilities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Ministry of Education	400.145	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R3	Support	Supports CCZ-R3 as it provides for educational facilities as a permitted activity.	Retain CCZ-R3 (Educational facilities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.35	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R4	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R4 (Recreation activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R4	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R4 (Recreation activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.36	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R5	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R5 (Arts, culture, and entertainment activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R5	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R5 (Arts, culture and entertainment activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.37	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R6	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R6 (Emergency service facilities) as notified.	Accept.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Century Group Limited	238.1	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R6	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R6 (Emergency service facilities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.315	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R6	Support	Supports the rule as it makes provision for new emergency service facilities within the zone. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate stations anywhere within the urban and rural environment.	Retain CCZ-R6 (Emergency service facilities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.38	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R7	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R7 (Marae activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R7	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R7 (Marae activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.39	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R8	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R8 (Community corrections activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R8	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R8 (Community corrections activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R8	Support	Considers that community corrections activities are essential social infrastructure and play a valuable role in reducing reoffending. They enable people and communities to provide for their social and cultural well-being and for their health and safety. It is important that provision is made to enable noncustodial community corrections sites to establish, operate and redevelop, within appropriate areas, as the demand for these services is likely to increase as a result of urban intensification. The permitted activity status (enabled by the associated policies) is appropriate in the context of the current and potential future establishment and operation of a community corrections facility or facilities within these areas in Wellington City.	Retain CCZ-R8 (Community corrections activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R9	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R9 (Public transport activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R9	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R9 (Public transport activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.41	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R10	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R10 (Visitor accommodation activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R10	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R10 (Visitor accommodation activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.42	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R11	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R11 (Repair and maintenance service activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R11	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R11 (Repair and maintenance service activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.43	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Support	Supports the range of permitted activities provided for in the City Centre Zone (CCZ-R1 to CCZ-R12).	Retain rule CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.61	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	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 CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Stratum Management Limited	249.28	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Amend	Amend point (iv) of the rule to ensure consistency.	Amend CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) as follows: iv. At ground level on any site not contained within a Natural Hazard Overlay.	Accept in part.	Yes
Stratum Management Limited	249.29	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Amend	Considers that the establishment of a residential activity is provided for as a permitted activity with four conditions. None of those conditions would lead to a requirement for limited notification.	Seeks that the notification status under CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) is amended to preclude both limited notification and public notification.	Accept.	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.112	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Support	Supports residential activities being permitted in the City Centre zone.	Retain CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.722	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Support in part	Supports this rule in part as residential activities should be enabled in the City Centres, but seeks that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active frontages are only applied to key roads Considers it is unclear why verandah coverage is an issue for residential development particularly when ground floor development is controlled on active frontages and non-residential activity frontages in accordance with LCZ-P4 Reference to natural hazards is removed as it is considered these matters are controlled by Natural Hazard rules and the proposed wording is inconsistent with this approach as this encourages residential development in hazard overlay areas. Considers this is unnecessary duplication 	Retain CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.723	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Amend	Supports this rule in part as residential activities should be enabled in the City Centres, but seeks that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active frontages are only applied to key roads Considers it is unclear why verandah coverage is an issue for residential development particularly when ground floor development is controlled on active frontages and non-residential activity frontages in accordance with LCZ-P4 Reference to natural hazards is removed as it is considered these matters are controlled by Natural Hazard rules and the proposed wording is inconsistent with this approach as this encourages residential development in hazard overlay areas. Considers this is unnecessary duplication 	Amend CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) to only apply active frontages where necessary such as along principal roads/arterials not necessary along connecting streets as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Activity status: Permitted where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The activity is located: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Above ground floor level; or At ground level along any street not identified as requiring verandah coverage; or At ground level on any site contained within a Natural Hazard Overlay. Activity status: Discretionary Restricted Discretionary 	Accept in part.	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.724	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Amend	Supports this rule in part as residential activities should be enabled in the City Centres, but seeks that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the activity status for non-compliance is amended to Restricted Discretionary and appropriate matters of discretion are restricted to Policy 7 and 8 matters. 	Amend CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) as follows: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Activity status: Discretionary Restricted Discretionary where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance with the requirements of CCZ-R12.1.a cannot be achieved. Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R12.2.a is precluded from being publicly notified.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.725	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Amend	Supports this rule in part as residential activities should be enabled in the City Centres, but seeks that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the activity status for non-compliance is amended to Restricted Discretionary and appropriate matters of discretion are restricted to Policy 7 and 8 matters 	Seeks to add matters of discretion to CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) that are limited to simple design limitations.	Reject.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.66	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R12	Support	Supports residential activities being permitted in the City Centre Zone.	Retain CCZ-R12 (Residential activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R13	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R13 (Industrial activities, excluding repair and maintenance service activities) as notified.	Accept in part – minor and inconsequential amendments.	No.
Victoria University of Wellington Students' Association	123.59	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Support	Supports the discouragement of ground-level car parks in the city centre.	Retain CCZ-R14 (Car-parking activities) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.44	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Oppose in part	Considers there may be circumstances where there are functional needs to provide car parking at ground level. It is more appropriate for notification to be determined on a case-by-case basis in these circumstances and for the effects of this activity to be considered as a Restricted Discretionary activity.	Amend CCZ-R14 (Carparking activities) to remove mandatory notification for at grade car parks.	Reject.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.45	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Oppose in part	Considers there may be circumstances where there are functional needs to provide car parking at ground level. It is more appropriate for notification to be determined on a case-by-case basis in these circumstances and for the effects of this activity to be considered as a Restricted Discretionary activity.	Amend CCZ-R14 (Carparking activities) activity status from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary for non-compliance with the permitted activity conditions.	Reject.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.18	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R14 (Carparking activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
McDonald's	274.61	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Oppose	Opposed to the Discretionary Activity status for car parking activities that do not comply with the permitted activity requirements. Furthermore, if the car parking is not visible then this should be a should be a permitted activity as per the other centre zones.	Retain CCZ-R14 (Carparking activities), subject to amendments outlined other submission points.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
McDonald's	274.62	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Amend	Opposed to the Discretionary Activity status for car parking activities that do not comply with the permitted activity requirements. Furthermore, if the car parking is not visible then this should be a should be a permitted activity as per the other centre zones.	Amend CCZ-R14.1 (Carparking activities) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The activity involves: <u>i. Provision of carparks not visible at the street edge or public space; or</u> <u>ii. Provision of carparks above ground floor level; or</u> iii. Provision of carparks below ground floor level; or iv. <u>iv.</u> Provision of parking spaces for people with disabilities; or v. <u>v.</u> Provision of ground floor level carparks that form part of a building specifically constructed and used for carparking purposes.	Reject.	No.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	FS103.27	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Oppose	Space in the centres is valuable, but the use of that space can have a wide range of effects (negative and positive), including on the character, perceptions of safety, road user behaviour, walkability and choice of transport mode. It is considered appropriate that non-compliant car parking provision consider a wide range of effects.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
McDonald's	274.63	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Amend	Opposed to the Discretionary Activity status for car parking activities that do not comply with the permitted activity requirements. Furthermore, if the car parking is not visible then this should be a should be a permitted activity as per the other centre zones.	Amend CCZ-R14.2 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of CCZ-R14.1.a cannot be achieved.	Reject.	No.
McDonald's	274.64	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Oppose	Opposes the requirement for public notification of any carparks at ground level in the City Centre Zone.	Delete the notification clause under CCZ-R14.2 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R14.2.a must be publicly notified.	Reject.	No.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.86	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Amend	Considers that CCZ-R14.2 should be amended so that the activity status of this standard infringement is changed to restricted discretionary. It is considered that this status, plus the suggested matters of discretion, will ensure an appropriate assessment of effects is undertaken, whilst providing a level of certainty to applicants that where activities are anticipated, such assessments will be rational and streamlined. The mandatory public notification status for infringing is proposed to be deleted as this is unnecessarily onerous in the context of the infringement.	Amend CCZ-R14.2 (Carparking activities) as follows: 2. Activity status: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with the requirements of CCZ-R14.1.a is not achieved. <u>Matters of discretion are:</u> <u>1. The matters in CCZ-P2, CCZ-P3, CCZ-P4, CCZ-P7, CCZ-P9 and CCZ-P10; 2.</u> <u>The cumulative effect of the development on:</u> a. <u>The ongoing viability and vibrancy of the Zone;</u> b. <u>The safety and efficiency of the transport network, including providing for a range of transport modes;</u> c. <u>The hierarchy of roads, travel demand or vehicle use; and</u> <u>3. The compatibility with other activities provided for in the zone.</u> Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R14.2.a must be publicly notified.	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.23	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Support	Submission point 359.86 supports FSNI submission 476.53 and 476.54.	Allow / Allow submission in part.	Reject.	No.
Reading Wellington Properties Limited	441.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Oppose	Opposes the requirement for full public notification of any resource consents sought under Rule CCZ-R14.2 Reading Wellington Properties Limited hold resource consents for ground level car parking on two of our sites (200 Wakefield Street and 24 Tory Street). Both were granted on a non-notified basis, on the fact that adverse effects were appropriately mitigated. The mitigation meant neither full or limited notification was necessary. The notification clause is opposed and should be removed, as it prevents applications for such an activity from being assessed on their merits. Decisions on notification should be made on the basis of effect, not on the basis of a rule.	Amend CCZ-R14.2. (Carparking activities) by removing the notification clause.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Reading Wellington Properties Limited	441.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Amend	Opposes the requirement for full public notification of any resource consents sought under Rule CCZ-R14.2. Reading Wellington Properties Limited hold resource consents for ground level car parking on two of our sites (200 Wakefield Street and 24 Tory Street). Both were granted on a non-notified basis, on the fact that adverse effects were appropriately mitigated. The mitigation meant neither full or limited notification was necessary. The notification clause is opposed and should be removed, as it prevents applications for such an activity from being assessed on their merits. Decisions on notification should be made on the basis of effect, not on the basis of a rule.	Amend CCZ-R14.2. (Carparking activities) by removing the notification clause.	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.53	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Oppose	Opposes the Discretionary Activity status in CCZ-R14 for car parking activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity requirements.	Amend CCZ-R14 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> ...	Reject.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	F584:102	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Oppose	Greater Wellington oppose this submission point. A "discretionary" activity status provides necessary controls for carparking activities which align with the direction of Proposed RPS Change 1, including objectives CC.1 and CC.3, and policies CC.1, CC.3 and CC.9	Disallow / Seeks that the provisions be retained as notified and support provisions that support active transport nodes.	Accept.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.54	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Amend	Opposes the Discretionary Activity status in CCZ-R14 for car parking activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity requirements.	Amend CCZ-R14 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Discretionary <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> ...	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.55	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Amend	Considers that if the carparking is not visible then this should be a permitted activity in CCZ-R14 as per the other centre zones.	Amend CCZ-R14 (Carparking activities) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The activity involves: i. <u>Provision of carparks not visible at the street edge or public space;</u> or ii. Provision of carparks above ground floor level; or ...	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.56	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R14	Oppose	Opposes the requirement in CCZ-R14 for public notification of any carparks at ground level in the City Centre Zone.	Amend CCZ-R14 (Carparking activities) as follows: ... Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R14.2.a. must be publicly notified.	Reject.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.19	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R15	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R15 (Yard-based retailing activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.119	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R15	Support in part	CCZ-R15 (yard-based retail activities) is supported in so much as it provides for yard-based retail activities (the definition of which includes service stations) as a discretionary activity.	Retain CCZ-R15 (Yard-based retailing activities) with amendment.	Accept in part.	Yes
Z Energy Limited	361.120	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R15	Amend	Considers that CCZ-R15 should be amended to not require public notification, as it may have a range of unintended outcomes. For instance, the requirement for public notification for any operational change, upgrading or maintenance to an existing yard-based activity where public notification would be more appropriately determined through standard notification tests. It may also discourage existing activities from undertaking important maintenance and upgrades, for instance, to better accord with good practise, introduce new technologies, or change to meet demand. CCZ-R15 should be clarified to address operation, maintenance, and upgrade of existing service station / yard-based retail activity are not subject to this requirement, which is not considered appropriate for existing activities. An additional exclusion to the notification status is appropriate only where the existing or new activity is located on the edge of the zone or adjacent to an arterial or collector road. These locations and/or interfaces do not have nor should they expect the same urban design outcomes and levels of visual amenity compared to a centrally located site in the CCZ for example. A service station, for example, would not impact the function and vitality of a centre zone if it were located on the edge of the zone where it can appropriately transition to an adjoining zone.	Amend CCZ-R15 (Yard-based retailing activities) as follows: 1. Activity status: Discretionary Notification Status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R15 must be publicly notified except: <u>a. The activity relates to the maintenance, operation and upgrading of an existing activity;</u> <u>b. The new or existing activity adjoins another commercial zone, a residential zone or an arterial or collector Road.</u>	Accept in part.	Yes
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.153	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R15	Support in part	CCZ-R15 is supported in so much as the rule provides for yard-based retail activities as a discretionary activity. It is understood that an application for resource consent made in respect of this rule, however, must be publicly notified in accordance with the Notification Status.	Retain CCZ-R15 (Yard-based retailing activities) with amendment.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.154	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R15	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-R15 should be amended as the notification requirement is not supported as it may have a range of unintended outcomes. For instance, without clarification, it may require public notification for any operational change, upgrading or maintenance to an existing yard-based activity where public notification would be more appropriately determined through standard notification tests. It may therefore also discourage existing activities from undertaking important maintenance and upgrades, for instance, to meet requirements of HSNO / HSWA legislation, better accord with good practise, introduce new technologies, or necessary changes to meet demand.</p> <p>Ongoing operation, maintenance, and upgrades of existing service stations / yard-based retail activities should not be subject to this notification requirement, which is not appropriate for existing lawful activities.</p> <p>It is considered that an additional exclusion to the notification status is appropriate only where the existing or new activity is located on the edge of the zone or adjacent to an arterial or collector road. These locations and/or interfaces do not have, nor should they expect, the same urban design outcomes and levels of visual amenity compared to a centrally located site in the CCZ for example. A service station, for example, would not impact the function and vitality of a centre zone if it were located on the edge of the zone where it can appropriately transition to the adjoining zone.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-R15 (Yard-based retailing activities) as follows:</p> <p>Notification Status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R15 must be publicly notified <u>except</u>:</p> <p>a. <u>The activity relates to the maintenance, operation and upgrading of an existing activity;</u></p> <p>b. <u>The new or existing activity adjoins another commercial zone, a residential zone or an arterial or collector Road.</u></p>	Accept in part.	Yes.
Century Group Limited	238.2	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R16	Support	Supports the range of activities with a permitted activity status in the City Centre Zone, as being reflective of the outcomes that are anticipated for a Central Business District.	Retain CCZ-R16 (All other land use activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.46	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R17	Support	Supports the permitted status for maintenance and repair of buildings under CCZ-R17 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures)	Retain CCZ-R17 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.316	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R17	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the CCZ is a permitted activity	Retain CCZ-R17 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.193	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R17	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-R17 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.113	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R17	Support	Supports maintenance and repair of existing buildings and structures being permitted.	Retain CCZ-R17 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.67	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R17	Support	Supports repair and maintenance of existing buildings being a Permitted activity.	Retain CCZ-R17 (Maintenance and repair of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.317	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the CCZ is a permitted activity.	Retain CCZ-R18 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.194	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-R18 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.278	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	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 CCZ-R18 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.279	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	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 CCZ-R18 (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.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.114	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Amend	Supports demolition or removal of a building being permitted where it is required for the purposes of constructing a new building or adding to or altering an existing building. However, Argosy opposes that demolition or removal of a building that cannot comply with CCZ-R18.1.a or b would require resource consent as a non-complying activity. There may be practical reasons why a building might need to be demolished or removed before a resource consent is sought for a new building, for example if a staged development is being undertaken. It would be more appropriate for this rule to be a restricted discretionary activity. The notification status for rule CCZ-R18.2.a is supported.	<p>Amend CCZ-R18.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures):</p> <p>2. Activity status: Non-complying <u>Restricted discretionary</u></p>	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.726	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Support in part	Supports this rule in part but seeks clarification, and any necessary amendments, to ensure that this rule will not have an unintended consequence of constraining staged developments.	Seeks to amend CCZ-R18 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as necessary to avoid potential unintended consequence of constraining staged development.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Oyster Management Limited	404.68	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Support in part	Supports demolition or removal of a building being permitted where it is required for the purposes of constructing a new building or adding to or altering an existing building.	Retain CCZ-R18 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendments.	Reject.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.69	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Amend	Opposes demolition that cannot comply with CCZ-R18.1.a or CCZ-R18.1.b being a non-complying activity. Considers there are practical reasons for demolition being required before consent is granted for a new building, e.g. in the case of staged developments. Considers an RD activity status would be appropriate.	Amend CCZ-R18 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as follows: ... 2. Activity status: Non-complying <u>Restricted discretionary</u> ...	Reject.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Support	Supports notification status for rule CCZ-R18.2.a.	Retain notification status of CCZ-R18.2.a (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.60	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Oppose in part	Seeks amendments to CCZ-R18 to provide for demolition as a restricted discretionary activity where it does not comply with CCZ-R18.1. Supports the intention of the rule to enable demolition of this rule to provide for a new building, and supports the preclusion of public and limited notification, we have concerns that as notified it may constrain staged developments that require demolition and clearing of a larger site to enable development. A restricted discretionary activity status with preclusion of notification would provide greater certainty for development while ensuring that Council still retains appropriate discretion to ensure quality design outcomes.	Opposes the Non-complying activity status at CCZ-R18.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures).	Reject.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.61	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Amend	Seeks amendments to CCZ-R18 to provide for demolition as a restricted discretionary activity where it does not comply with CCZ-R18.1. Supports the intention of the rule to enable demolition of this rule to provide for a new building, and supports the preclusion of public and limited notification, we have concerns that as notified it may constrain staged developments that require demolition and clearing of a larger site to enable development. A restricted discretionary activity status with preclusion of notification would provide greater certainty for development while ensuring that Council still retains appropriate discretion to ensure quality design outcomes.	Option 1: Amend CCZ-R18.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to have a Restricted Discretionary activity status as follows: ... 2. Activity Status: Non-complying <u>Restricted Discretionary</u>	Reject.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.62	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R18	Amend	Alternatively, seeks for a discretionary activity status, which would be consistent with MCZ-R19 in the Metropolitan Centre Zone.	Option 2: Amend CCZ-R18.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to have a Discretionary activity status as follows: ... 2. Activity Status: Non-complying <u>Discretionary</u>	Reject.	No.
Paul Burnaby	44.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) is partially supported because of the preclusion of public notification.	Retain the preclusion for public notification under CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Paul Burnaby	44.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Oppose in part	CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) is partially opposed because of the preclusion for limited notification.	Amend CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows: ... Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R19.2.a which results in noncompliance with CCZ-55, CCZ-59, CCZ-S10, CCZ-S11, CCZ-S12 and CCZ-S13 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.47	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports the permitted activity status for activities that comply with the specified conditions.	Retain CCZ-R19.1 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.48	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports the preclusion of limited and public notification under CCZ-R19.2.	Retain notification clauses under CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.49	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	Seeks that the references to the design guides in the matters of discretion of CCZ-R19 are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought. It is not appropriate to provide the Council discretion to consider all matters in the Design Guide. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Amend CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) so that the references to the design guides in the matters of discretion are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Wellington City Council	266.157	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	Considers a notification status statement is missing in relation to developments where all standards are met.	Amend CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows: Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R19.2.a which complies with all standards is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified. (...)	Accept.	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.245	art 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	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.	Yes
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.245	art 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	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.	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.318	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support	Supports the rule as the construction or, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures within the CCZ is a permitted activity.	Retain CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
McDonald's	274.65	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Oppose in part	Oppose the requirement for restricted discretionary consent where additions and alterations change the exterior to the building above veranda level and are visible from public spaces.	Retain CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures), subject to amendment outlined other submission points.	Reject.	No.
McDonald's	274.66	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	Considers where compliance can be achieved with the relevant standards, this should be a permitted activity otherwise McDonald's considered there to be a risk that this will result in the perverse outcome of parts of exterior facades not being updated.	Seeks the following amendment to CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows: 1a. Any alterations or additions to a building or structure that: i. Do not alter the external appearance of the building or structure; or ii. Relate to a building frontage below veranda level, including entranceways and glazing and compliance with CCZ-S8 is achieved; or iii. Do not result in the creation of new residential units; and iv. Are not visible from public spaces; and v. i. Comply with standards CCZ-S1, CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3, CCZ-S4, CCZ-S5, CCZS6, CCZ-S7 and CCZ-S8.	Reject.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.195	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Oppose	Opposed to the cross reference to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide within the matters of discretion. The cross reference to the policies of the CCZ is sufficient to ensure that development achieves a "good quality, well-functioning environment" as required by CCZ-O3. ... Matters of discretion are: ... 4. The Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; and 5.4. ...	Amend CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: ... 4. The Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; and 5.4. ...	Accept in part.	Yes
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.295	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports additions and alterations to a retirement village being provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under CCZ-R19. Does not oppose the inclusion of matters of discretion in Clause 2 relating to the extent and effect of non-compliance with CCZ S1 – CCZ-S13. Considers however the matters of discretion in Clause 1 are not appropriate. The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Furthermore, opposes the inclusion of CCZ-P11 in Clause 1 relating to the City Outcomes Contribution or the reasons provided in response to CCZ-P11 above. Considers that due to an absence of any reference to retirement villages in the Centres and Mixed Use and Residential Design Guides their inclusion as matters of discretion in Clauses 3 and 4 are not of relevance / applicable to retirement villages and should be deleted. 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 offered by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites.	Retain CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.296	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	Supports additions and alterations to a retirement village being provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under CCZ-R19. Does not oppose the inclusion of matters of discretion in Clause 2 relating to the extent and effect of non-compliance with CCZ S1 – CCZ-S13. Considers however the matters of discretion in Clause 1 are not appropriate. The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Furthermore, opposes the inclusion of CCZ-P11 in Clause 1 relating to the City Outcomes Contribution or the reasons provided in response to CCZ-P11 above. Considers that due to an absence of any reference to retirement villages in the Centres and Mixed Use and Residential Design Guides their inclusion as matters of discretion in Clauses 3 and 4 are not of relevance / applicable to retirement villages and should be deleted. 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 offered by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites.	<p>Amend CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>... 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: ... 1. The matters in CCZ-P4, CCZ-P5, CCZ-P6, CCZ-P7, CCZ-P8 CCZ-P9, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P11 and CCZ-P12 (<u>this clause is not applicable to retirement villages</u>); ... 4. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building (this clause is not applicable to retirement villages); and 5. The Residential Design Guide (this clause is not applicable to retirement villages); and 6. For retirement villages: i. <u>The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces; ii. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;iii. When assessing the matters in 2(a)(2), and 2(a)(6)(i)–(iii), consider: a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u> b. <u>The functional and operational needs of the retirement village. iv. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u></p>	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.297	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	Supports additions and alterations to a retirement village being provided for as a permitted or restricted discretionary activity under CCZ-R19. Does not oppose the inclusion of matters of discretion in Clause 2 relating to the extent and effect of non-compliance with CCZ S1 – CCZ-S13. Considers however the matters of discretion in Clause 1 are not appropriate. The listed policies are broad and not specific to the effects of retirement villages that require management. Furthermore, opposes the inclusion of CCZ-P11 in Clause 1 relating to the City Outcomes Contribution or the reasons provided in response to CCZ-P11 above. Considers that due to an absence of any reference to retirement villages in the Centres and Mixed Use and Residential Design Guides their inclusion as matters of discretion in Clauses 3 and 4 are not of relevance / applicable to retirement villages and should be deleted. 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 offered by retirement villages; the functional and operational needs of retirement villages; and the need to provide for efficient use of larger sites.	Amend CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows: ... Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R19.2 which complies with CCZ-S5, CCZ-S9, CCZ-S10, CCZ-S11, CCZ-S12 and CCZ-S13 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified. An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R19.2 which results from noncompliance with CCZ-S1, CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3, CCZ-S4, CCZ-S6, CCZ-S7 and CCZ-S8 is precluded from being publicly notified. <u>An application for resource consent for a retirement village made in respect of rule CCZ-R19.2 is precluded from being publicly notified.</u> <u>An application for resource consent for a retirement village made in respect of rule CCZ-R19.2 where compliance is achieved with CCZ-S1 - CCZ-S3 is precluded from being limited notified.</u>	Reject.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.115	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	Supports that alterations and additions to buildings or structures are permitted, however the requirement that they do not alter the external appearance of a building or structure would likely make all alterations and additions non-compliant with the permitted activity rule. It is considered that the other standards are sufficient to control alterations and additions that can occur as a permitted activity. Argosy also supports alterations and additions to buildings or structures that do not comply with CCZ-R19.1 being a restricted discretionary activity. However, Argosy opposes Policy CCZ-P11 and the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution being included in matters of discretion, as stated above. Supports applications for resource consent made in respect of CCZ-R19.2.a being precluded from limited or public notification because this is appropriate for alterations or additions to existing buildings within a city centre to achieve the intended development capacity.	Amend CCZ-R19 (Additions and alterations to buildings and structures): 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Any alterations or additions to a building or structure that: Do not alter the external appearance of the building or structure; or 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. Compliance with any of the requirements of CCZ-R19.1 cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in CCZ-P4, CCZ-P5, CCZ-P6, CCZ-P7, CCZ-P8, CCZ-P9, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P11 and CCZ-P12; 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with CCZ-S1, CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3, CCZ-S4, CCZ-S5, CCZ-S6, CCZ-S7, CCZ-S8, CCZ-S9, CCZ-S10, CCZ-S11, CCZ-S12 and CCZ-S13; 3. Construction impacts on the transport network; 4. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide , including guideline G107 - City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; and 5. The Residential Design Guide.	Accept in part	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.11	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support	The relief sought will enable intensification, consistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act.	Allow	Accept in part.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.11	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support	The relief sought will enable intensification, consistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act.	Allow	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.727	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports this rule in part, and particularly the preclusion of public and limited notification. Seeks amendments to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought, and to remove reference to the "City Outcomes Contribution". Considers it is unclear why the creation of new residential units needs control as residential activities are encouraged in the City Centre and other rules control the location of residential activities.	Retain CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) and seeks amendments.	Accept in part	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.728	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	Supports this rule in part, and particularly the preclusion of public and limited notification. Seeks amendments to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought, and to remove reference to the “City Outcomes Contribution”. Considers it is unclear why the creation of new residential units needs control as residential activities are encouraged in the City Centre and other rules control the location of residential activities.	Amend CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows: Activity status: Permitted where: ... iii. Do not result in the creation of new residential units; and 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary ... Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in CCZ-P4, CCZ-P5, CCZ-P6, CCZ P7, CCZ-P8 CCZ-P9, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P11 and CCZ-P12 ; 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with CCZ S1, CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3, CCZ-S4, CCZ-S5, CCZ-S6, CCZ-S7, CCZ-S8, CCZ-S9, CCZ-S10, CCZ-S11, CCZ-S12 and CCZ-S13; 3. Construction impacts on the transport network; 4. <u>The following urban design outcomes</u> a. <u>Provides an effective public private interface;</u> b. <u>The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u> c. <u>Provides high quality buildings;</u> 5. The Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; and 6. The Residential Design Guide. ...	Accept in part	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.163	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Not specified	The RVA supports the intent of the relief sought, however, The RVA seeks for new rules to be included specifically for retirement villages in line with The RVA’s primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA’s primary submission regarding the changes sought for retirement villages under CCZ-R19 and CCZ-R20.	Accept in part	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.163	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Not specified	Ryman supports the intent of the relief sought, however, Ryman seeks for new rules to be included specifically for retirement villages in line with Ryman’s primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman’s primary submission regarding the changes sought for retirement villages under CCZ-R19 and CCZ-R20.	Accept in part	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.71	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports that additions and alterations are Permitted.	Retain CCZ-R19 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) with amendments.	Accept in part	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.72	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	Supports that additions and alterations are Permitted. Does not support that the Permitted activity status requires there to be no alterations to external appearance of the building. The submitter considers that this requirement would likely make all alterations and additions non-compliant with the permitted activity rule. Considers that other standards are sufficient to control alterations as a Permitted activity.	Amend CCZ-R19.1.a (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) to: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Any alterations or additions to a building or structure that: + Do not alter the external appearance of the building or structure; or ii. Relate to a building frontage below verandah level, including entranceways and glazing and compliance with CCZ-S8 is achieved; or iii. Do not result in the creation of new residential units; and iv. Are not visible from public spaces; and v. Comply with standards CCZ-S1, CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3, CCZ-S4, CCZ-S5, CCZ-S6, CCZ-S7 and CCZ-S8.	Reject.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.73	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	Supports that additions and alterations that are unable to comply with CCZ-R19.1 being a RD activity.	Retain CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as notified.	Reject in part – changes to CCZ-R19 recommended	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.74	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support	Supports that applications for consent under CCZ-R19.2.a being precluded from public and limited notification.	Retain CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as notified.	Reject in part – changes to CCZ-R19 recommended	No.
Investore Property Limited	405.132	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	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 CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.	Reject in part – changes to CCZ-R19 recommended	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.103	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	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.	Accept in part.	Yes
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.103	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	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.	Accept in part.	Yes
Investore Property Limited	405.133	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	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 CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.104	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR19	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	FS128.104	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR19	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
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.168	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	Submitter generally supports the intent of the Design Guides, but opposes their inclusion in the District Plan for the following reasons: - In many areas, the Design Guides overlap with the objectives and policies in Part 3. This will cause confusion for both planners and developers in attempting to interpret the Design Guides alongside Part 3. In particular, the submitter queries how the 'Outcomes' in the Design Guides are to be read alongside other provisions in the plan. - It will be simpler to update the Design Guides to reflect best practice if they remain non-statutory. - The way the Design Guides are included as relevant criteria for restricted discretionary activities significantly expands the Council's discretion beyond what could normally be expected, for example, the Residential Design Guide contains various provisions dealing with internal areas such as G114-116 (internal living spaces) and G130-131 (internal storage).	Amend CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: ... 4. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; and ...	Reject in part.	Yes.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.101	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support	Submission point 416.168 supports FSNI submission point 476.1 & 476.102.	Allow	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.258	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR19	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	FS128.258	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR19	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.
Fabric Property Limited	425.63	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	Opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list. The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of "density done well" as stated in the Design Guide. Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.	Amend CCZ-R19.2.4 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows: ... 3. Construction impacts on the transport network; and 4. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; and ...	Accept in part.	Yes.
Fabric Property Limited	425.64	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports CCZ-R19 in part, and in particular supports the preclusion of limited and public notification, and the permitted activity status for activities that comply with the specified conditions.	Retain CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures), with amendments.	Reject in part – changes to CCZ-R19 recommended	Yes
Fabric Property Limited	425.65	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports CCZ-R19 in part, and in particular supports the preclusion of limited and public notification, and the permitted activity status for activities that comply with the specified conditions.	Retain CCZ-R19.1 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as notified, with respect to the permitted activity status for activities that comply with the specified conditions.	Reject in part – changes to CCZ-R19 recommended	Yes
Fabric Property Limited	425.66	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Oppose in part	The requirement that additions and alterations do not alter the external appearance of a building or structure would likely make all alterations and additions non-compliant with the permitted activity rule. It is considered that the other standards are sufficient to control alterations and additions that can occur as a permitted activity, and Fabric opposes rule CCZR19.1. a.i.	Opposes CCZ-19.1.a.i (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) insofar as this would make all alterations and additions that alter the external appearance of the building non-compliant with the permitted activity rule.	Reject in part – changes to CCZ-R19 recommended	Yes
Fabric Property Limited	425.67	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Oppose in part	Seeks that the references to the design guides and Policy CCZ-P11 in the matters of discretion of CCZR19 are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion to consider all matters in the design guides. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Opposes CCZ-19.2.1 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) with respect to the CCZP11 (City outcomes contribution) as a matter of discretion, and seeks amendment.	Reject in part – changes to CCZ-R19 recommended	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.25	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR19	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.	Accept in part	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.25	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR19	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.	Accept in part	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.68	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Oppose in part	Seeks that the references to the design guides and Policy CCZ-P11 in the matters of discretion of CCZR19 are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion to consider all matters in the design guides. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Opposes CCZ-19.2.4 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) with respect to the references to the design guides as a matter of discretion, and seeks amendment.	Reject in part – changes to CCZ-R19 recommended	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.26	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR19	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.	Accept in part.	Yes
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.26	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR19	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.	Accept in part.	Yes
Fabric Property Limited	425.69	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Oppose in part	Seeks that the references to the design guides and Policy CCZ-P11 in the matters of discretion of CCZR19 are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion to consider all matters in the design guides. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Opposes CCZ-19.2.5 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) with respect to the references to the design guides as a matter of discretion, and seeks amendment.	Reject in part – changes to CCZ-R19 recommended	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.27	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR19	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.	Accept in part.	Yes
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.27	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR19	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.	Accept in part.	Yes
Fabric Property Limited	425.70	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Amend	Seeks that the references to the design guides and Policy CCZ-P11 in the matters of discretion of CCZR19 are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion to consider all matters in the design guides. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Amend CCZ-19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in CCZ-P4, CCZ-P5, CCZ-P6, CCZ-P7, CCZ-P8 CCZ-P9, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P11 and CCZ-P12; 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with CCZ-S1, CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3, CCZ-S4, CCZ-S5, CCZ-S6, CCZ-S7, CCZ-S8, CCZ-S9, CCZ-S10, CCZ-S11, CCZ-S12 and CCZ-S13; 3. Construction impacts on the transport network; 4. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; and 5. The Residential Design Guide.	Reject in part – changes to CCZ-R19 recommended	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.28	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR19	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA's primary submission.	Accept in part.	Yes
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.28	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR19	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission where it seeks to remove the design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission, which sought to expressly exclude retirement villages from having to apply the Design Guides, as they have substantially different operational and functional needs.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman's primary submission.	Accept in part.	Yes
Fabric Property Limited	425.71	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R19	Support in part	Supports CCZ-R19 in part, and in particular supports the preclusion of limited and public notification, and the permitted activity status for activities that comply with the specified conditions.	Retain notification clauses under CCZ-R19.2 (Alterations and additions to buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part – changes to notification clauses recommended	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.50	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support in part	Supports the preclusion of limited and public notification under CCZ-R20.2.	Retain notification clauses under CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part – changes to CCZ-R20 recommended	yes
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.51	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Seeks that the references to the design guides in the matters of discretion of CCZ-R20 are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought. It is not appropriate to provide the Council discretion to consider all matters in the Design Guide. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Amend CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) so that the references to the design guides in the matters of discretion are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought.	Accept in part.	Yes
Stratum Management Limited	249.30	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	<p>Considers that Rule CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) controls the construction of new buildings in the zone.</p> <p>It includes two non-notification statements that reference various standards. Under the first statement, non-compliance with certain standards can be addressed without either public or limited notification. This statement is supported.</p> <p>Under the second statement, non-compliance with the listed standards can be addressed without public notification, but limited notification remains a possibility, to be determined in accordance with the applicable statutory tests. This statement is supported overall, but deletion of the reference to standard CCZ-S1 is sought. CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) is the maximum height standard. The effects of a maximum height breach can be determined without need for limited notification as they can be objectively assessed with reference to the potential effects caused.</p> <p>An additional non-notification statement is sought for a situation where all standards are complied with. This would appear to be inferred in the construction of the rule but should be objectively stated as the non-notification statements are only currently engaged where at least one standard is not complied with.</p> <p>A minor change is sought to matter of discretion (3) to clarify its applicability.</p>	<p>Seeks that the third matter of discretion under CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) is amended as follows:</p> <p>3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline 97 107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that <u>does not meet the minimum height requirements, or exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building.</u></p>	Accept in part.	Yes
Stratum Management Limited	249.31	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	<p>Considers that Rule CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) controls the construction of new buildings in the zone.</p> <p>It includes two non-notification statements that reference various standards. Under the first statement, non-compliance with certain standards can be addressed without either public or limited notification. This statement is supported.</p> <p>Under the second statement, non-compliance with the listed standards can be addressed without public notification, but limited notification remains a possibility, to be determined in accordance with the applicable statutory tests. This statement is supported overall, but deletion of the reference to standard CCZ-S1 is sought. CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) is the maximum height standard. The effects of a maximum height breach can be determined without need for limited notification as they can be objectively assessed with reference to the potential effects caused.</p> <p>An additional non-notification statement is sought for a situation where all standards are complied with. This would appear to be inferred in the construction of the rule but should be objectively stated as the non-notification statements are only currently engaged where at least one standard is not complied with.</p> <p>A minor change is sought to matter of discretion (3) to clarify its applicability.</p>	<p>Seeks that CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) is amended to include new non-notification statement as follows:</p> <p><u>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule R20.2.a which does not result in any non-compliances with the listed standards is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified.</u></p>	Accept.	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Stratum Management Limited	249.32	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	<p>Considers that Rule CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) controls the construction of new buildings in the zone.</p> <p>It includes two non-notification statements that reference various standards. Under the first statement, non-compliance with certain standards can be addressed without either public or limited notification. This statement is supported.</p> <p>Under the second statement, non-compliance with the listed standards can be addressed without public notification, but limited notification remains a possibility, to be determined in accordance with the applicable statutory tests. This statement is supported overall, but deletion of the reference to standard CCZ-S1 is sought. CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) is the maximum height standard. The effects of a maximum height breach can be determined without need for limited notification as they can be objectively assessed with reference to the potential effects caused.</p> <p>An additional non-notification statement is sought for a situation where all standards are complied with. This would appear to be inferred in the construction of the rule but should be objectively stated as the non-notification statements are only currently engaged where at least one standard is not complied with.</p> <p>A minor change is sought to matter of discretion (3) to clarify its applicability.</p>	Seeks that the second non notification statement under CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) is amended to remove the reference to standard CCZ-S1 (Maximum height).	Accept	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.152	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	Oppose	Considers that height is very important for controlling and regulating effects and as such should be specifically referenced as a discretionary matter and part of the notification tests.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.48	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	Oppose	Height is very important for controlling and regulating effects and as such should be specifically referenced as a discretionary matter and part of the notification tests.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Wellington City Council	266.158	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Considers a notification status statement is missing in relation to developments where all standards are met.	Amend CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) as follows: Notification status: <i>An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-R20.2 a which complies with all standards is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified. (...)</i>	Accept.	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.246	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	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.	Yes
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.246	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	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.	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.319	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support	Supports the rule as the construction or, or additions and alterations to, buildings and structures within the CCZ is a permitted activity.	Retain CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part – changes to CCZ-R20 recommended.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.196	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Oppose	Opposed to the cross reference to the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide within the matters of discretion. The cross reference to the policies of the CCZ is sufficient to ensure that development achieves a "good quality, well-functioning environment" as required by CCZ-O3.	Amend CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) as follows: ... Matters of discretion are: ... 4. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; and 5-4, 6-5, 7-6, ...	Accept in part.	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.298	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support in part	Supports CCZ-R20 and the permitting of the construction of buildings and structures when complying with the relevant built form standards; and the triggering of more restrictive activity statuses based on non-compliance with relevant built form standards. Considers that the construction of a retirement village should be a restricted discretionary activity, and that in addition to the matters of discretion of any infringed standard, the construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). Considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.	Retain CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.299	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Supports CCZ-R20 and the permitting of the construction of buildings and structures when complying with the relevant built form standards; and the triggering of more restrictive activity statuses based on non-compliance with relevant built form standards. Considers that the construction of a retirement village should be a restricted discretionary activity, and that in addition to the matters of discretion of any infringed standard, the construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). Considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.	Amend CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted ... 2. Activity status: Restricted discretionary ... 3. <u>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where:</u> a. <u>The application is for a retirement village.</u> Matters of discretion are: 1. <u>The matters in CCZ-P1, CCZ-P2, CCZ-P3, CCZ-P5, CCZ-P6, CCZ-P7, CCZ-P8, CCZ-P9, CCZ-P10 and CCZ-P13;</u> 2. <u>The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints;</u> 3. <u>The impacts of related construction activities on the transport network;</u> 4. <u>The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure;</u> 5. <u>The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> 6. <u>The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> 7. <u>When assessing the matters in 1 -4, consider:</u> a. <u>The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u> b. <u>The functional and operational needs of the retirement village;</u> 8. <u>The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u> <u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village.</u>	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.300	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Supports CCZ-R20 and the permitting of the construction of buildings and structures when complying with the relevant built form standards; and the triggering of more restrictive activity statuses based on non-compliance with relevant built form standards. Considers that the construction of a retirement village should be a restricted discretionary activity, and that in addition to the matters of discretion of any infringed standard, the construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities). Considers the matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.	Amend CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) as follows: ... <u>Notification:</u> ... - <u>An application for resource consent for a retirement village made in respect of rule CCZ-R20.3 is precluded from being publicly notified.</u> - <u>An application for resource consent for a retirement village made in respect of rule CCZ-R20.3 where compliance is achieved with CCZ-S1, CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3 is precluded from being limited notified.</u>	Reject.	No.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.87	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Considers that CCZ-R20.1 should be amended to establish a baseline for supermarket operations within the LCZ that is greater than the current threshold of 100m2 for new buildings on account of the general operational requirements of the stores. This proposed baseline of 450m2 is considered a commensurate response given the typical scale of supermarket buildings in this zone.	Amend CCZ-R20.1 (Construction of buildings and structures) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: a. It involves the construction of any new building or structure that: i. Will have a gross floor area of 100m2 or less; and ii. <u>Will have a gross floor area of less than 450m2 where it accommodates a supermarket; and</u> iii. Will result in a building coverage of no more than 20 percent; b. Compliance with CCZ-S1, CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3, CCZ-S4, CCZ-S5, CCZ-S6, CCZ-S7, CCZ-S8, CCZ-S9, CCZ-S10, CCZ-S11, CCZ-S12 and CCZ-S13 is achieved.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Woolworths New Zealand	359.88	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Considers that CCZ-R20.2 should be amended to reflect changes to standard CCZ-S4 which would exclude supermarkets from compliance with the minimum building height standard. There are also concerns around the inclusion of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide within these matters of discretion on account of the unnecessary scope this introduces in a restricted discretionary consenting framework. As such, it is specifically sought that that this is excluded from the matters of discretion for new supermarket buildings.	Amend CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) as follows: Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. <u>For all buildings excluding supermarkets, compliance with any of the requirements of CCZ-R20.1, excluding CCZ-S4, cannot be achieved.</u> b. <u>For supermarkets compliance with any of the requirements of CCZ-R20.1, cannot be achieved.</u> <u>Note: Supermarkets are not required to comply with CCZ-S4</u> Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in CCZ-P4, CCZ-P5, CCZ-P6, CCZ-P7, CCZ-P8, CCZ-P9, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P11 and CCZ-P12; 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with CCZ-S1, CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3, CCZ-S5, CCZ-S6, CCZ-S7, CCZ-S8, CCZ-S9, CCZ-S10, CCZ-S11, CCZ-S12 and CCZ-S13; 3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G407-97 - City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building (excluding supermarkets); 4. The Residential Design Guide; 5. The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints; 6. The impacts of related construction activities on the transport network; and 7. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure.	Reject.	No.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.89	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Considers that CCZ-R20.2 should be amended to reflect changes to standard CCZ-S4 which would exclude supermarkets from compliance with the minimum building height standard. There are also concerns around the inclusion of the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide within these matters of discretion on account of the unnecessary scope this introduces in a restricted discretionary consenting framework. As such, it is specifically sought that that this is excluded from the matters of discretion for new supermarket buildings.	Amend CCZ-R20.3 (Construction of buildings and structures) as follows: 3. Activity status: Discretionary Where: a. <u>Compliance with the requirements of CCZ-S4 cannot be achieved, unless the development is a supermarket.</u> Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ- R20.3 which results in non-compliance with CCZ-S4 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified. Comment:	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.24	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support	Submission point 359.89 CCZ-R20 has similar outcome to FSNi submission point 476.57.	Allow / Allow submission if submission point 476.57 is rejected.	Reject.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.116	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Supports construction of buildings being a permitted activity where it complies with Rule CCZ-R20.1 or a restricted discretionary activity where it complies with Rule CCZ-R20.2 except as stated below. Argosy opposes Policy CCZ-P11 and the Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution being included in matters of discretion, as stated above. Argosy also opposes “the extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints” being included as a matter of discretion. This is unclear and could have the effect of giving the consent authority unrestricted discretion, and should be deleted. Alternatively, it should be amended to identify the types of constraints which may be relevant. For example, similar language could be used to the assessment criteria for some restricted discretionary activities in the City Centre zone of the Auckland Unitary Plan which include “whether there are particular site development characteristics in terms of unusual site size, shape or orientation, or the location and nature of existing buildings which have constrained the form of the development proposed” (H8.8.2). Argosy also opposes buildings below the minimum building height of 22m being a discretionary activity, and seeks for this to be a restricted discretionary activity. This would enable flexibility where there are practical constraints on buildings being constructed which are below 22m, while enabling the Council to retain its discretion in relation to matters which relate to maximising the benefits of intensification.	Amend CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures): 2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: a. <u>Compliance with any of the requirements of CCZ-R20.1, excluding CCZ-S4, cannot be achieved.</u> Matters of discretion are: 1. <u>The matters in CCZ-P4, CCZ-P5, CCZ-P6, CCZ-P7, CCZ-P8, CCZ-P9, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P11 and CCZ-P12;</u> 2. <u>The extent and effect of non-compliance with CCZ-S1, CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3, CCZ-S5, CCZ-S6, CCZ-S7, CCZ-S8, CCZ-S9, CCZ-S10, CCZ-S11, CCZ-S12 and CCZ-S13;</u> 3. <u>The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 - City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building;</u>	Accept in part.	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.12	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	Support	The relief sought will enable intensification, consistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act.	Allow	Accept in part.	Yes
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.12	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	Support	The relief sought will enable intensification, consistent with the intent of the Enabling Housing Act.	Allow	Accept in part.	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.729	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support in part	Supports this rule in part, and particularly the preclusion of public and limited notification. Seeks amendments to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought, and to remove reference to the “City Outcomes Contribution”	Retain CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) and seeks amendments.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.730	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Supports this rule in part, and particularly the preclusion of public and limited notification. Seeks amendments to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought, and to remove reference to the “City Outcomes Contribution”	Amend CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: 1. Compliance with any of the requirements of CCZ-R20.1, excluding CCZ-S4, cannot be achieved. Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in CCZ-P4, CCZ-P5, CCZ-P6, CCZ-P7, CCZ P8, CCZ-P9, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P11 and CCZ-P12; 2. The extent and effect of non-compliance with CCZ S1, CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3, CCZ-S5, CCZ-S6, CCZ-S7, CCZ S8, CCZ-S9, CCZ-S10, CCZ-S11, CCZ-S12 and CCZ-S13; 3. <u>The following urban design outcomes</u> a. <u>Provides an effective public private interface;</u> b. <u>The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood; and</u> c. <u>Provides high quality buildings;</u> 4. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; 5. The Residential Design Guide;	Accept in part.	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.164	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	Not specified	The RVA supports the intent of the relief sought, however, The RVA seeks for new rules to be included specifically for retirement villages in line with The RVA’s primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within The RVA’s primary submission regarding the changes sought for retirement villages under CCZ-R19 and CCZ-R20.	Accept in part.	Yes
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.164	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	Not specified	Ryman supports the intent of the relief sought, however, Ryman seeks for new rules to be included specifically for retirement villages in line with Ryman’s primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission point, subject to the relief sought within Ryman’s primary submission regarding the changes sought for retirement villages under CCZ-R19 and CCZ-R20.	Accept in part.	Yes
Oyster Management Limited	404.75	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support in part	Supports construction of buildings being a permitted activity where it complies with Rule CCZ-R20.1 or a restricted discretionary activity where it complies with Rule CCZ-R20.2.	Retain CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures) with amendments.	Reject.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.76	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Oppose	Considers that point 5 of the Matters of Discretion in CCZ-R20.2 is unclear and may result in Council having unrestricted discretion. Considers this should be deleted, or amended to identify types of constraints that may be relevant [Refer to original submission for full reason] .	Amend CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) as follows: Matters of discretion are: ... 4. The Residential Design Guide; 5. The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints; 6. The impacts of related construction activities on the transport network; and 7. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure. OR Amend point 5 above to clarify what types of site constraints may be relevant.	Reject.	No.
Investore Property Limited	405.134	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	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 CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.105	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	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.	Accept in part.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.105	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	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.	Accept in part.	No.
Investore Property Limited	405.135	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	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 CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) to remove the Design Guide as a matter of discretion and replace with specific design outcomes that are sought.	Accept in part.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.106	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	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.	Accept in part.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.106	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	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.	Accept in part.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.169	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	Amend	Submitter considers that changes are required to CCZ-R20 for the following reasons: - The Design Guides should be non-statutory [Refer to original submission for full reason]. - The City Outcomes Contribution will not be required if height limits are removed [Refer to original submission for full reason]. - "The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints" is vague and will be difficult to apply. It appears to refer to technical constraints which developers will necessarily take into account outside of the RM process. - "The impacts of related construction activities on the transport network" [Refer to original submission for full reason]. - "The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure" – This should be managed via development contributions / financial contributions.	Amend CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) as follows: ... 3. The Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; 4. The Residential Design Guide; 5. The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints; 6. The impacts of related construction activities on the transport network; and 7. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure. ...	Reject in part.	Yes.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.259	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	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.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.277	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	Not specified	The RVA supports the deletion of Design Guides along with removal of the reference to "City Outcome Contributions" and preclusions for public and limited notification which is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points regarding deletions and notification preclusions, subject to the relief sought by The RVA.	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.259	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	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.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.277	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	Not specified	Ryman supports the deletion of Design Guides along with removal of the reference to "City Outcome Contributions" and preclusions for public and limited notification which is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points regarding deletions and notification preclusions, subject to the relief sought by Ryman.	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.170	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	Amend	Submitter considers that changes are required to CCZ-R20 for the following reasons: - The Design Guides should be non-statutory [Refer to original submission for full reason]. - The City Outcomes Contribution will not be required if height limits are removed [Refer to original submission for full reason]. - "The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints" is vague and will be difficult to apply. It appears to refer to technical constraints which developers will necessarily take into account outside of the RM process. - "The impacts of related construction activities on the transport network" [Refer to original submission for full reason]. - "The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure" – This should be managed via development contributions / financial contributions.	Seeks that CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) be amended (to clarify that applications that comply with all the relevant standards will not be notified) as follows: ... Notification status: ... An application for resource consent made in respect of Rule 20.2.a which complies with CCZ-S1 to S13 is precluded from being either publicly or limited notified. ...	Accept in part – changes to the notification clauses recommended	Yes.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.274	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	Support	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Allow	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.278	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	Not specified	The RVA supports the deletion of Design Guides along with removal of the reference to "City Outcome Contributions" and preclusions for public and limited notification which is consistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points regarding deletions and notification preclusions, subject to the relief sought by The RVA.	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.274	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	Support	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.278	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR20	Not specified	Ryman supports the deletion of Design Guides along with removal of the reference to "City Outcome Contributions" and preclusions for public and limited notification which is consistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points regarding deletions and notification preclusions, subject to the relief sought by Ryman.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Fabric Property Limited	425.72	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	<p>Opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules.</p> <p>Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>The 'City Outcomes Contributions' have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of "density done well" as stated in the Design Guide.</p> <p>Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-R20.2.3 (City Outcomes Contribution) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building;</p> <p>...</p>	Accept in part.	Yes.
Fabric Property Limited	425.73	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support in part	Supports CCZ-R20 in part, and in particular supports the preclusion of limited and public notification, and the permitted activity status for activities that comply with the specified conditions.	Retain CCZ-R20 (Construction of buildings and structures), with amendments.	Accept in part – changes to CCZ-R20 recommended	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.74	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Oppose in part	Seeks that the references to the design guides and Policy CCZ-P11 in the matters of discretion of CCZ-R20 are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion to consider all matters in the design guides. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Opposes CCZ-20.2.1 (Construction of buildings and structures) with respect to the CCZ-P11 (City outcomes contribution) as a matter of discretion, and seeks amendment.	Accept in part – COC to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	yes
Fabric Property Limited	425.75	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Oppose in part	Seeks that the references to the design guides and Policy CCZ-P11 in the matters of discretion of CCZ-R20 are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion to consider all matters in the design guides. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Opposes CCZ-20.2.3 (Construction of buildings and structures) with respect to the references to the design guides as a matter of discretion, and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.76	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Oppose in part	Seeks that the references to the design guides and Policy CCZ-P11 in the matters of discretion of CCZ-R20 are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion to consider all matters in the design guides. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	Opposes CCZ-20.2.4 (Construction of buildings and structures) with respect to the references to the design guides as a matter of discretion, and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.77	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Oppose in part	Seeks clarification on "the extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints" in the matters of discretion. This is unclear and could have the effect of giving the consent authority unrestricted discretion, and should be deleted. Alternatively, it should be amended to identify the types of constraints which may be relevant.	Opposes CCZ-R20.2.5 (Construction of buildings and structures) with respect to 'the extent and effect of any site constraints'.	Reject.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.78	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Seeks clarification on "the extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints" in the matters of discretion. This is unclear and could have the effect of giving the consent authority unrestricted discretion, and should be deleted. Alternatively, it should be amended to identify the types of constraints which may be relevant.	<p>Clarify CCZ-R20.2.5 (Construction of buildings and structures) is amended to identify the types of constraints which may be relevant.</p> <p>[As an alternative to deleting this matter of discretion]</p>	Reject.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.79	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Amend	Seeks that the references to the design guides and Policy CCZ-P11 in the matters of discretion of CCZ-R20 are removed and replaced with references to the specific design outcomes that are sought. It is not appropriate to provide that the Council's discretion to consider all matters in the design guides. This does not give any clear direction or certainty for applicants, and would be onerous for the preparation and assessment of resource consent applications.	<p>Amend CCZ-20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Matters of discretion are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The matters in CCZ-P4, CCZ-P5, CCZ-P6, CCZ-P7, CCZ-P8, CCZ-P9, CCZ-P10, CCZ-P11 and CCZ-P12; The extent and effect of non-compliance with CCZ-S1, CCZ-S2, CCZ-S3, CCZ-S5, CCZ-S6, CCZ-S7, CCZ-S8, CCZ-S9, CCZ-S10, CCZ-S11, CCZ-S12 and CCZ-S13; The Centres and Mixed-Use Design Guide, including guideline G107 – City Outcomes Contribution for any building that exceeds the maximum height requirement and either comprises 50 or more residential units or is a non-residential building; The Residential Design Guide; The extent and effect of any identifiable site constraints; The impacts of related construction activities on the transport network; and The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure. 	Reject in part.	Yes.
Fabric Property Limited	425.80	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R20	Support in part	Supports CCZ-R20 in part, and in particular supports the preclusion of limited and public notification, and the permitted activity status for activities that comply with the specified conditions.	Retain notification clauses under CCZ-R20.2 (Construction of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part – changes to CCZ-R20 recommended	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.320	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Support in part	Supports the rule as the matters of discretion for these restricted discretionary activities include consideration of the availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, particularly where this may involve the conversion of non-habitable rooms to residential use. A minor amendment is however sought to include the necessity to connect to three waters infrastructure including for the purposes of firefighting.	Supports CCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities), with amendment.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.321	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Amend	Supports the rule as the matters of discretion for these restricted discretionary activities include consideration of the availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, particularly where this may involve the conversion of non-habitable rooms to residential use. A minor amendment is however sought to include the necessity to connect to three waters infrastructure including for the purposes of firefighting.	Amend CCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities) as follows: Matters of discretion are: ... 3. The relevant guidance contained within the Residential Design Guide; and 4. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure; and 5. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, including for firefighting purposes.	Reject.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.117	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Support	Supports the conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities being a restricted discretionary activity as this may be appropriate as part of a well-functioning urban environment.	Retain CCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings for residential activities) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.731	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Support in part	Supports this rule in part, and particularly supports the preclusion public and limited notification. Seeks amendments to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought.	Retain CCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities) and seeks amendments.	Accept in part.	Yes
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.732	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Amend	Supports this rule in part, and particularly supports the preclusion public and limited notification. Seeks amendments to remove direct reference to the design guide and to instead articulate the urban design outcomes that are sought.	Amend CCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities) as follows: 1. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are: 1. The matters in CCZ-P1, CCZ-P4 and CCZ-P10; 2. The extent of compliance with standards CCZ-S9, CCZ-S10 and CCZ-S13 and satisfaction of associated assessment criteria; 3. The relevant guidance contained within the Residential Design Guide; The following centres urban design outcomes: a. <u>Provides an effective public private interface;</u> b. <u>The scale, form, and appearance of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood;</u> c. <u>Provides high quality buildings; and</u> 4. The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure....	Accept in part.	Yes
Oyster Management Limited	404.77	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Amend	Considers that the RD activity status of converting buildings or parts of buildings is likely to prevent conversions occurring. Considers there should be a tiered activity status approach subject to standards, appropriate matters of control, or discretion.	Amend Rule CCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities) to provide for conversion of office to residential as either a permitted, controlled or restricted discretionary activity subject to compliance with appropriate standards (permitted), or appropriate matters of control and discretion (controlled and restricted discretionary).	Reject.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.78	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Support	Supports that building conversions will not be limited or publicly notified.	Retain notification status of CCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities) for all activity statuses.	Reject.	No.
Investore Property Limited	405.136	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	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 CCZ-R21.1 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities) and seeks amendment.	Accept in part.	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.107	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	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.	Accept in part.	Yes
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.107	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	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.	Accept in part.	Yes
Investore Property Limited	405.137	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	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 CCZ-R21.1 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential 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	FS126.108	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	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.	Accept in part.	Yes
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.108	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	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.	Accept in part.	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.171	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R21	Amend	Submitter considers that changes are required to CCZ-R21 for the following reasons: - The Design Guides should be non-statutory [Refer to original submission for full reason]. - “The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure” – This should be managed via development contributions / financial contributions.	Amend CCZ-R21 (Conversion of buildings, or parts of buildings, for residential activities) as follows: ... 3- The relevant guidance contained within the Residential Design Guide; and 4- The availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure. ...	Accept in part.	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.260	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR21	Not specified	The RVA supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with The RVA’s primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with The RVA’s primary submission.	Accept in part.	Yes
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.279	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR21	Not specified	The RVA supports the deletion of Design Guides along with removal of the reference to “City Outcome Contributions” and preclusions for public and limited notification which is consistent with The RVA’s primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points regarding deletions and notification preclusions, subject to the relief sought by The RVA.	Accept in part.	Yes
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.260	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR21	Not specified	Ryman supports the relief sought in this submission as it relates to the removal of design guidelines from the District Plan but opposes them remaining as a non-statutory tool as this is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission.	Amend / Allow submission point as it relates to the removal of design guidelines and otherwise disallow the point in line with Ryman’s primary submission.	Accept in part.	Yes
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.279	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZR21	Not specified	Ryman supports the deletion of Design Guides along with removal of the reference to “City Outcome Contributions” and preclusions for public and limited notification which is consistent with Ryman’s primary submission.	Amend / Allow the submission points regarding deletions and notification preclusions, subject to the relief sought by Ryman.	Accept in part.	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.322	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R22	Support in part	Considers it important that screening of outdoor storage areas as a visual mitigation will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Such mitigation should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. Where this is not possible, mitigation should not be required.	Supports CCZ-R22 (Outdoor storage areas), with amendment.	Accept.	Yes
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.323	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-R22	Amend	Considers it important that screening of outdoor storage areas as a visual mitigation will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Such mitigation should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. Where this is not possible, mitigation should not be required.	Amend CCZ-R22 (Outdoor storage areas) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The storage area is screened by either a fence or landscaping of 1.8m in height from any adjoining road or site. b. Screening does not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities.	Accept.	Yes
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.172	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R1	Amend	Submitter considers that the activities that are permitted overlook Educational Facilities. Submitter considers that generally, the activities considered in this section are very narrow – for example, childcare activities are not permitted, which is a current activity within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Seeks that CCZ-PREC01 Permitted Activity rules are expanded to consider more activities. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept.	Yes
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.173	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R2	Amend	Submitter considers that the activities that are permitted overlook Educational Facilities. Submitter considers that generally, the activities considered in this section are very narrow – for example, childcare activities are not permitted, which is a current activity within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Seeks that CCZ-PREC01 Permitted Activity rules are expanded to consider more activities. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part.	Yes
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.174	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R3	Amend	Submitter considers that the activities that are permitted overlook Educational Facilities. Submitter considers that generally, the activities considered in this section are very narrow – for example, childcare activities are not permitted, which is a current activity within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Seeks that CCZ-PREC01 Permitted Activity rules are expanded to consider more activities. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part.	Yes
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.175	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R4	Amend	Submitter considers that the activities that are permitted overlook Educational Facilities. Submitter considers that generally, the activities considered in this section are very narrow – for example, childcare activities are not permitted, which is a current activity within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Seeks that CCZ-PREC01 Permitted Activity rules are expanded to consider more activities. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part.	Yes
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.176	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R5	Amend	Submitter considers that the activities that are permitted overlook Educational Facilities. Submitter considers that generally, the activities considered in this section are very narrow – for example, childcare activities are not permitted, which is a current activity within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Seeks that CCZ-PREC01 Permitted Activity rules are expanded to consider more activities. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part.	Yes
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.177	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R6	Amend	Submitter considers that the activities that are permitted overlook Educational Facilities. Submitter considers that generally, the activities considered in this section are very narrow – for example, childcare activities are not permitted, which is a current activity within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Seeks that CCZ-PREC01 Permitted Activity rules are expanded to consider more activities. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part.	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Parliamentary Service	375.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R7	Amend	There are two separate CCZ-PREC01-R7 in the CCZ chapter.	Amend the City Centre Zone chapter to remove the double CCZ-PREC01-R7 provision. [[Inferred decision requested]]	Accept.	Yes
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.118	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R7	Amend	This is because: - This provision elevates what is normally a design guide into a rule. A design guide should be separate to a plan. The Design Guide should be an external document to the District Plan and be referenced as a guide only. - Further, this provision, provides a mechanism for the Council to require these aspects as part of a development. This is inappropriate. A development should be assessed on its merits.	Amend CCZ-PREC01-R7 (Construction of buildings and structures, additions and alterations to buildings and structures): Matters of discretion are: ... 3. The Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide;	Reject in part.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	F583.32	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZPREC01-R7	Oppose	The design guides include important matters. It is entirely appropriate to reference them in a rule for a restricted discretionary activity.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.178	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R7	Amend	Submitter considers that the activities that are permitted overlook Educational Facilities. Submitter considers that generally, the activities considered in this section are very narrow – for example, childcare activities are not permitted, which is a current activity within Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct.	Seeks that at minimum, amend CCZ-PREC01-R7 (All other land use activities) by re-numbering the CCZ-PREC01-R7 as CCZ-PREC01-R8.	Accept in part.	Yes
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.179	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R7	Amend	Submitter notes this rule number is incorrect. Based on current drafting it should be number CCZPREC01-R8.	Amend CCZ-PREC01-R7 (Construction of buildings and structures, additions and alterations to buildings and structures) rule numbering to CCZ-PREC01-R8.	Accept in part.	Yes
Wellington Civic Trust	F583.27	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZPREC01-R7	Support	The submission identifies a minor error in the Plan's numbering and seeks that it is corrected to avoid confusion.	Allow	Accept in part.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.180	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-R7	Amend	Submitter notes that the notification status for CCZ-PREC01-R7 requires any application for resource consent to be publicly notified. Submitter considers that this will unnecessarily fetter development in the Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct and also add cost and delay to even minor alterations or additions to structures within the precinct. Submitter considers that Council has not provided sufficient justification for mandatory notification.	Amend CCZ-PREC01-R7 (Construction of buildings and structures, additions and alterations to buildings and structures) as follows: Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-PREC01-R7.1 must be publicly notified. An application for resource consent made in respect of rule CCZ-PREC01-R7.1 which complies with CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3 and CCZ-S5 to CCZ-S13 is precluded from being either limited or publicly notified.	Accept in part.	Yes
Wellington Civic Trust	F583.28	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZPREC01-R7	Support	This area is one of Wellington's most important public spaces (the other being the nearby Waterfront). The public have a very high level of interest in this area. New buildings and additions and alterations (as defined in the Plan) all have the potential to affect the character and quality of the public space they help create. They should thus all be subject to mandatory public notification.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Andrew Haddleton	23.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes the height of 28.5m along Kent Terrace as this will block views and sunlight.	Reject the increased building height provided for at CCZ-S1.	Reject.	No.
Andrew Haddleton	23.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the allowable height of buildings along Kent Terrace specifically those up to 28.5m will block views and sunlight.	Seeks that the allowable building height on the Courtenay Place end of Kent Terrace be 18m.	Reject.	No.
Paul Burnaby	44.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that 110 Wakefield St (West Plaza Hotel) should have a maximum height of 73m to match the maximum height of the immediately adjoining building at 103 Wakefield St.	Amend height control at 110 Wakefield St (West Plaza Hotel) to 73m.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.153	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS1	Oppose	Considers the amendment requested significantly exceeds the notified height control in the proposed district plan (42m) and is not justified on the basis that the site "adjoins" a different site that is across the road. Considers a 73m building at 101 Wakefield Street would create unreasonable shading effects near Civic Square including in the parklet in Lombard Street.	Disallow	Accept.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Juliet Cooke	68.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>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.</p> <p>Heritage and character are qualifying matters under MRZ Pt1 Sch 1.</p> <p>Considers that 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.</p> <p>Considers that Moir Street will have adverse effects due to the potential for development in neighbouring CCZ zoning.</p> <p>Moir street is a key and coherent character and heritage area.</p> <p>Moir street is unique with the amount of overlapping relevant overlays.</p> <p>[See submission for further detail]</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S1.1 (Maximum Height) to add k as follows:</p> <p>1. The following maximum...</p> <p>k. <u>Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania St 15m</u></p> <p>[Refer to original submission for map of area]</p>	Accept – 15m height recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Tracey Paterson	74.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Opposes CCZ-S1 as currently drafted.</p> <p>CCZ-S1 will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design.</p> <p>Moir Street is unique due to its classification as MRZ, Character Precinct, Heritage Area and adjacency to CCZ. As currently drafted, the standards of the proposed plan will allow buildings of up to 28.5m high to tower over 1-2 story heritage cottages on Moir St. The proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation.</p> <p>The Standards of the CCZ proposed Plan will lead to significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development with a direct impact on residential properties that have recognised heritage and character values on Moir Street.</p> <p>The standards will result in outcomes that are contrary to the objectives and policies of the PDP (CCZ)</p>	<p>Reject CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) -</p> <p>i. Height Area 9 - South-East, South-West Zone Edge</p>	Accept – 15 m height limit recommended	Yes
Tracey Paterson	74.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Amend CCZ-S1 to add a Height Control Area of 15m for Hania Street.</p> <p>The current provision would allow inappropriate scale of development adjacent to land which is zoned for residential purposes or has a character or heritage overlay.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>k. <u>Height Control Area 11 - Hania Street - 15m</u></p>	Accept – 15m height recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Conor Hill	76.24	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Opposes height limits in the CCZ as these set limits on achieving as much development as possible.</p> <p>Considers that developers and geotechnical experts should determine what these are.</p>	Delete CCZ-S1 (Maximum Height) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Nico Maiden	77.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Height limits are arbitrary and unnecessary because new builds require resource consents.</p> <p>Removal of height limits will enable more compact housing in the city centre.</p> <p>Removal of height limits will help comply with NPS-UD.</p>	Delete CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) in it's entirety.	Reject.	No.
Te Herenga Waka Victoria University of Wellington	106.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support in part	<p>The University seeks an exception to the Height Control Area 1 limit to reflect the existing scale of buildings on the Rutherford House site (23 Lambton Quay).</p>	<p>Amend standard CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows:</p> <p>Location</p> <p>a. Height Control Area 1 – Thorndon Quay (<u>except Rutherford House site (23 Lambton Quay)</u>) Limit 35.4m (Rutherford House site (23 Lambton Quay) - 56m)</p>	Reject.	No.
Darko Petrovic	124.1	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that height limits in all sections of the Central CBD area that do not interfere with viewshafts should be removed.</p> <p>Imposing height limits on central area building developments will reduce the intensification potential of the plan and limit the development potential at a time when diverse housing supply in the central area is needed. If removing height limits is not a possibility, a compromise solution would be to have the height limits increased substantially.</p>	Seeks that height limits in all sections of the Central CBD area that do not interfere with viewshafts be removed.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Darko Petrovic	124.2	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Height Control Area 5 (CBD East) is too restrictive and should be removed. Imposing height limits on central area building developments will reduce the intensification potential of the plan and limit the development potential at a time when diverse housing supply in the central area is needed. If removing height limits is not a possibility, a compromise solution would be to have the height limits increased substantially.	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum Height) to remove Height Control Area 5 (CBD East).	Reject.	No.
Darko Petrovic	124.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Height Control Area 6 (CBD West) is too restrictive and should be removed. Imposing height limits on central area building developments will reduce the intensification potential of the plan and limit the development potential at a time when diverse housing supply in the central area is needed. If removing height limits is not a possibility, a compromise solution would be to have the height limits increased substantially.	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum Height) to remove Height Control Area 6 (CBD West).	Reject.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.52	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Precinct seeks amendments to CCZ-S1 to provide unlimited building heights in the City Centre zone. Policy 3 of the NPS-UD requires district plans of Tier 1 urban environments such as Wellington to enable "building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification" in city centre zones. For the City Centre zone this should mean unlimited building heights. Unlimited building heights in the City Centre area are appropriate given the emphasis in the Wellington Spatial Plan and Proposed District Plan on the City Centre for accommodating future growth, recognising the height of existing buildings in these areas, and taking into account the absence of any directly adjoining residential areas that could potentially be adversely affected. This would also be consistent with CCZ-P5 which recognises the benefits of enabling greater height and scale of development in the City Centre. According to CCZ-D1 the Wellington City Centre is intended to be the primary commercial centre for the wider Wellington region. Yet the intensification planning instruments notified in Hutt City and Upper Hutt City provide for a greater scale of development than Wellington City with unlimited heights in their centres. Unlimited building heights in the Wellington City Centre would be consistent with its role as the primary commercial centre for the region. The heights provided under CCZ-S1 are particularly constraining for Precinct's sites in Thorndon including 20 Aitken Street and the Bowen Campus where a Maximum height of 27m applies. This is despite the fact that some of the existing buildings in this area are over 60m high. If the request to provide unlimited heights is not granted for these areas, Precinct requests that CCZ-S1 is amended to provide for building heights at least as great as that of the existing buildings.	Seeks amendments to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) to provide unlimited building heights in the City Centre zone.	Accept.	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.131	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS1	Oppose	Considers the submission is more enabling than justified. Considers the calibration of heights in accordance with the notified height control areas is more appropriate for a medium-sized coastal/harbour city that is susceptible to earthquakes and other natural hazards	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.53	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	If the request for unlimited building heights is not granted, Precinct requests that CCZ-S1 is amended to provide for building heights at least as great as that of the existing buildings.	Seeks that if CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) is not amended to provide for unlimited building heights, this standard be amended to provide for building heights at least as great as that of the existing buildings.	Accept.	Yes
James and Karen Fairhall	160.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that Height Control Area 9, in particular the interface between the Eastern side of Hania Street and the Western side of Moir Street, conflicts with the qualifying matters relating to CCZ-S1. Moir Street has quaint one to two storey little cottages built in the late 1980s which are all part of a Heritage and Special Character Area. Relating to the first qualifying matter: 28.5m buildings will absolutely destroy the streetscape of Moir Street which has been enjoyed and celebrated for years. Relating to the second qualifying matter: 28.5m buildings will completely remove any sense of privacy and dominate the little cottages of Moir Street (not to mention the affect on loss of sunlight and the corresponding affect on the health of the homes and residents). Relating to the third qualifying matter: Accept new houses need to be developed, however the scale needs to be done right. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: k. <u>Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u> [refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11]	Accept – 15m height recommended for Hania Street	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
James and Karen Fairhall	160.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design): CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7.</p> <p>CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. and CCZ-O7.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.a.ii. and CCZ-P9.2.a.iii.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject.	No.
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m.</p>	Accept – 15m height recommended	Yes.
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: <u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u></p> <p>[refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11].</p>	Accept – 15m height recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design): CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7.</p> <p>CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. to CCZ-O7.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject.	No.
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m.</p>	Accept – 15m height recommended	Yes.
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: <u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u></p> <p>[Refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11]</p>	Accept – 15m height recommended for Hania Street	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design): CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7.</p> <p>CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. to CCZ-O7.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject.	No.
Athena Papadopoulos	183.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m.</p>	Accept – 15m height recommended	Yes.
Athena Papadopoulos	183.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: <u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u></p> <p>[refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11]</p>	Accept – 15m height recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Athena Papadopoulos	183.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design): CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7.</p> <p>CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. to CCZ-O7.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject.	No.
Lara Bland	184.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m.</p>	Accept – 15m height recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Lara Bland	184.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: <u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u></p> <p>[refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11]</p>	Accept – 15m height recommended for Hania Street	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Lara Bland	184.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below: CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design): CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7. CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. to CCZ-O7.2.e. CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2. CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2. MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts). HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage). PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as proposed by this submission. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject.	No.
Geoff Palmer	188.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m.	Reject.	No.
Geoff Palmer	188.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: <u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u> [refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11]	Accept – 15m height recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Geoff Palmer	188.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3, and CCZ-S11 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below: CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design): CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7. CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. to CCZ-O7.2.e. CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2. CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2. MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts). HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage). PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as proposed by this submission. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject.	No.
Andrew Flanagan	198.18	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Seeks that all height limits are removed on developments in the City Centre Zone.	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height).	Accept in part – heights are thresholds not limits	No.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.35	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support	Supports the increase to the building height limits in Te Aro and along a portion of Adelaide road to accommodate for more people such as young professionals and students living in CBD.	Retain building heights in CCZ-S1 (Maximum building heights) for Te Aro and Adelaide Road as notified.	Accept.	No.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.36	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support	Supports keeping the building heights on the edge of City Centre in order to maintain a smooth transition into graduated residential areas.	Retain building heights in CCZ-S1 (Maximum building heights) as notified.	Accept in part – heights are thresholds not limits	No.
Dougal and Libby List	207.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m.	Accept – 15m height recommended	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Dougal and Libby List	207.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: <u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u> [Refer to original submission, including an illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11]	Accept – 15m height recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Dougal and Libby List	207.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3, and CCZ-S11 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below: CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design) as follows: CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7. CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. to CCZ-O7.2.e. CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as follows: CCZ-P9.2. CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2. MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts). HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage). PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as proposed by this submission. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject.	No.
Craig Forrester	210.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m and seeks amendment.	Accept – 15m height recommended	Yes.
Craig Forrester	210.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: <u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u> [refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11]	Accept – 15m height recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Jill Wilson	218.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes 12 storey building along Cable and Wakefield Street. Considers that the harbour side is a major asset for visitors and residents and that high rise building along the streets would impede visual access to the water. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as it relates to Wakefield Street and Cable Street.	Reject.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.21	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that the lack of an unlimited height control, or at the least an increase in the height limits throughout the City Centre Zone, is inconsistent with Policy 3(a) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 which requires the district plans of Tier 1 territorial authorities to enable specified outcomes, including "in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification" (Policy 3(a)). The Council's s32 Assessment does not adequately recognise this or respond to this requirement, and fails to recognise that economic conditions which constrain or enable high density/scale development will fluctuate within the lifespan of a district plan. Considers the section 32 analysis has not considered an option of unlimited building heights together with the application of other design controls and criteria. Considers that the Property (83-87 Waterloo Quay) is not subject to any protected views, or any other specific constraints that would otherwise justify the use of a 50m height limit (noting the Airport Designation WIAL1 is some 100m above the level of the Property), particularly in the absence of an identified 'qualifying matter'. The 50m Maximum Height standard, as it applies to the Property (83-87 Waterloo Quay) and the adjoining land, is inadequate with regards to the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020. Considers that other standards and designations are proposed to manage other outcomes that relate to the height of development.	Amend CC-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: Location 1.b. Height Control Area 2 - Waterloo Quay Section Limit <u>50m-Unlimited</u>	Reject in part – height control area 2 remains at 50m but as a threshold and not a limit.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Stratum Management Limited	249.33	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Imposition of height limits does not give effect to Policy 3(a) of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. The policy requires, in city centre zones, district plans to enable "building heights and urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification." The imposition of maximum building heights does not achieve this intent.	Remove standard CCZ-S1 (Maximum height).	Reject	No.
Generation Zero Inc	254.17	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Considers that a maximum height control in the City Centre Zone is inappropriate for the following reasons: - inconsistent with the policy direction of the NPS-UD- out of step with other local authorities. - focusses on preserving existing amenity -insufficient analysis and justification undertaken. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Delete provision CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) so that there are no maximum height limits in the City Centre Zone.	Accept in part – heights are thresholds not limits	No.
Wheeler Grace Trust	261.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Considers that the proposed Height Controls in Selwyn Terrace are inappropriate. 6 Storey buildings would significantly detract from the residential amenity of Selwyn Terrace. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) so that Selwyn terrace, Thorndon does not have a 27m maximum building height.	Reject.	No.
170 Wakefield Limited	267.1	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers it appropriate to increase the Height Control Area over 170 Wakefield St in order for the District Plan to be consistent with the NPS-UD, with respecting the WIAL1 designation. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks to amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height), Height Control Area 7 from 43.8m to 60m.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.154	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS1	Oppose	Considers the amendment requested significantly exceeds the notified height control in the proposed district plan (42m) and is not justified.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.324	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support	Supports the standard as the maximum height for any building is between 25m-93m	Retain CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Eldin Family Trust	287.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Considers that regardless of the zoning applied to Selwyn Terrace a minimum building height of 22m or a maximum if either 21m or 27m would be inappropriate. Considers that these building heights are inconsistent with the Viewshafts VS1 (The Beehive) and VS4 (The Beehive and The Cenotaph – Whitmore Street) which would clash with the viewshaft. Considers that tall buildings in Selwyn Terrace would detract from the residential amenity, special character and heritage of Selwyn Terrace and increase pressure on access, parking and turning. Considers that developers would face difficulty in complying with the minimum height requirements due to covenants on titles. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) with respect to Selwyn Terrace (and the nearby areas of Hill Street and Guildford Terrace) being subject to the 27m maximum height control (Height control area 3).	Reject.	No.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	Height Control Area 8 in the CCZ (City Centre Zone) is opposed due to the new CCZ limit of 42m everywhere as a minimum height is expandable by up to 50% extra in height. This leaves all existing home owners in buildings 6-9 storeys tall now facing the prospect of being surrounded by towers 14-20 storeys tall. These developments will also have negative effects on property values and cast shadows for entire blocks southward. Te Aro's soils are also not good ground to build tall buildings on. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum heights) Heigh Control Area 8 - Te Aro. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.163	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Allow	Reject.	No.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	Considers that the new CCZ (City Centre Zone) limits of 42m everywhere as a minimum height in CCZ, and expandable by up to 50% extra in height, leaves all existing home owners in buildings 6-9 storeys tall now facing the prospect of being surrounded by towers 14-20 storeys tall. These developments will also have negative effects on property values and cast shadows for entire blocks southward. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Not specified.	Reject.	No.
Paihiara Ki Pōneke Cycle Wellington	302.48	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Supports the PDP subject to amendments to ensure that the intensification outcomes required by the Resource Management Act 1991, as amended by the RM (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Act 2021 and the NPS-UD 2020 are enabled.	Seeks that all height limits at CCZ-S1 (Maximum heights) are removed.	Accept in part – limits are now thresholds.	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
James Coyle	307.23	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Retain CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m.	Accept – 15m height recommended	Yes.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.88	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS1	Support	Considers that it is necessary to protect heritage values of Mt Victoria heritage area (curtilage). [Interred reference to submission 312.6]	Allow	Accept.	No.
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: k. <u>Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u> [refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11].	Accept – 15m height recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.204	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS1	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.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.89	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS1	Support	Considers that it is necessary to protect heritage values of Mt Victoria heritage area (curtilage). [Interred reference to submission 312.7]	Allow	Reject.	No.
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3, and CCZ-S11 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP relating to amenity, design adverse effects and heritage.	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as proposed by this submission. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.197	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Peter Kennedy	353.1	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support in part	Supports CCZ-S1 in part in that the properties at 25 and 25A Taranaki Street are subject to the height control of 42.5m above ground level. The submitter notes that the owners of 25 and 25A Taranaki Street generally support the increase in height from the 27m provided in the Operative District Plan to 42.5m in the Proposed District Plan.	Retain CCZ-S1 (Maximum height), with amendments.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Peter Kennedy	353.2	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that given the sites are located in the City Centre Zone, and for the district plan to adopt the NPS-UD Policy 3.a, the height restriction of 42.5m should be removed [Refer to original submission for NPS-UD Policy 3 reference]. The submitter considers that to fully ‘maximise benefits of intensification’ the height of any structure should be determined by the buildability and constraints of the site such as ground conditions. Economic viability and design will naturally constrain the building heights as well, however the district plan should not limit height in the central zone so it can properly align with the NPS-UD. The submitter notes that nearly all of Wellington falls subject to the WIAL 1 designation, which restrict new buildings or structures from being above the RL of 56.98m unless shielded by an existing immovable object. The submitter considers that the Mount Victoria ridgeline extends well above this RL and shields the centre city from the airport. The submitter considers as such the maximum RL should be restricted by the height of the Mount Victoria.	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) to truly align the Proposed District Plan with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development while respecting WIAL 1 designation, as follows: 1. The following maximum height limits must be complied with (measured above ground level unless otherwise specified): Location Limit ... h. Height Control Area 8 –Te Aro 42.5 <u>60</u> m ... [See original submission for map]	Reject.	No.
U.S. Embassy Wellington	366.3	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Concerned about any structure adjacent to the United States Embassy being built to a height of 27 metres, particularly without any requirement for the Embassy to be notified of and consent to the proposed building project for security reasons	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) so that properties identified on a map surrounding the United States Embassy have a maximum height of 10m. [See original submission for map]	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Jane Szentivanyi	376.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	CCZ-S1 is opposed as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites. As currently drafted, CCZ-S1 will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties, as well as recognised heritage and character values which cannot be mitigated through design. As such, the provision is contrary to the objectives and policies of the plan.	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Jane Szentivanyi	376.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1 should be amended to have a new height control for the area along the eastern side of Hania Street.	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: ... h. Height Control Area 10 - Adelaide Road i. <u>Height Control Area 11 - eastern side of Hania St 15m</u> [Refer to map in submission]	Accept – 15m height recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
WCC Environmental Reference Group	377.481	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Whilst the submitter recognises the importance of safety in regards to Maximum build height of structures, the Wellington Central City Zone currently fails to adequately utilize the large amount of accessible open space provided by building tops. As such the submitter considers the standard should allow for the development of urban farming infrastructure, as these would likely extend beyond the 1m in diameter restriction placed upon decorative features, however these would need to be immobile and enclosed in order to prevent safety issues through structural compromise via weather events.	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: This standard does not apply to... B) <u>Enclosed immobile garden beds providing these do not extend beyond 2m in diameter or 1m in height.</u>	Reject.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.119	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Seeks an amendment to the assessment criteria where the standard is infringed to include the extent to which a taller building would contribute to business capacity in the city. The NPS-UD requires tier 1 territorial authorities to provide sufficient development capacity for both housing and business, and Policy 3 recognises that building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification. The Proposed Plan must give effect to the NPS-UD, and this could be achieved in part by amending the assessment criteria as submitted.	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height): Matters of discretion: ... <u>4. The extent to which taller buildings would contribute to maximising the benefits of intensification in the city</u>	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.733	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	Opposes the City Centre building height controls as notified and seeks that the building heights are simplified. Considers the Central Wellington City and the City Centre Zone should provide for unlimited building heights to encourage intensification and development. There are rules and standards in the District Plan that will control bulk, location and height of buildings in the city centre. Considers height should not be limited in the City Centre. Seeks simplification of the height controls.	Retain CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) and seeks amendments.	Accept in part.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	F584.50	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / General CCZ	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	391.734	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Opposes the City Centre building height controls as notified and seeks that the building heights are simplified. Considers the Central Wellington City and the City Centre Zone should provide for unlimited building heights to encourage intensification and development. There are rules and standards in the District Plan that will control bulk, location and height of buildings in the city centre. Considers height should not be limited in the City Centre. Seeks simplification of the height controls.	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows: <u>There is no maximum height for buildings and structures in the City Centre Zone</u> <u>Location Limit</u> a. <u>Height Control Area 1 – Thorndon Quay 35.4m</u> b. <u>Height Control Area 2 – Waterloo Quay section 50m</u> c. <u>Height Control Area 3 – Bulk of Thorndon 27m</u> d. <u>Height Control Area 4 – Mid and Upper Molesworth Street 43.8m</u> e. <u>Height Control Area 5 – CBD East 48.5m – 95m</u> f. <u>Height Control Area 6 – CBD West 75m-95m</u> g. <u>Height Control Area 7 – Eastern Edge of the CBD 42.5m</u> h. <u>Height Control Area 8 – Te Aro 42.5m</u> i. <u>Height Control Area 9 – South East, South West Zone Edge Adelaide Road 28.5m</u> j. <u>Height Control Area 10 – Adelaide Road 42.5m</u>	Accept in part.	Yes
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.130	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS1	Oppose	Considers the submission is more enabling than justified. Considers the calibration of heights in accordance with the notified height control areas is more appropriate for a medium-sized coastal/harbour city that is susceptible to earthquakes and other natural hazards	Disallow	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.128	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS1	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.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.40	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS1	Oppose	This amendment is more enabling than justified. Calibration of heights in accordance with the notified height control areas is more appropriate for a medium-sized coastal/harbour city that is susceptible to earthquakes and other natural hazards	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.39	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS1	Oppose	This amendment is more enabling than justified. Calibration of heights in accordance with the notified height control areas is more appropriate for a medium-sized coastal/harbour city that is susceptible to earthquakes and other natural hazards	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.79	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Considers the assessment criteria for non-compliance with CCZ-S1 should also include assessment of the extra business capacity added by infringing on height. Notes that the NPS-UD requires tier 1 territorial authorities to provide sufficient development capacity for both housing and business, and Policy 3 recognises that building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification.	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) to: Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. Streetscape and visual amenity effects; 2. Dominance and privacy effects on adjoining sites; and 3. The extent to which taller buildings would substantially contribute to increasing residential accommodation in the city; and 4. The extent to which taller buildings would contribute to maximising the benefits of intensification in the city (or words to similar effect).	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.169	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS1	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Allow	Reject.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.80	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Support	Supports the 75m Height Control Area applying to Lambton Quay.	Retain CCZ-S1.f (Maximum Height) Height Control Area 6 - CBD West's 75m Height Control Area extent as notified. [Refer to original submission for maps of the submitter's properties under the Proposed District Plan].	Accept.	No.
Victalabour	414.45	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes maximum height limits in the city centre zone. Identifies that Council staff recommended unlimited heights, backed by evidence. Considers there are a range of checks on building quality and safety that would regulate new builds. Considers that facilitating the development of more residential and office space will support greater affordability. Considers there is a lack of support for new forms of density in the CBD. Considers that maximum height restrictions pose an unnecessary restriction on development and contributes to sprawl.	Seeks that maximum height limits in the City Centre Zone as notified are removed and unlimited height limits are introduced.	Accept.	Yes
Victalabour	414.46	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	Opposes maximum height limits in the city centre zone. Identifies that Council staff recommended unlimited heights, backed by evidence. Considers there are a range of checks on building quality and safety that would regulate new builds. Considers that facilitating the development of more residential and office space will support greater affordability. Considers there is a lack of support for new forms of density in the CBD. Considers that maximum height restrictions pose an unnecessary restriction on development and contributes to sprawl.	Seeks that maximum height limits in the City Centre Zone as notified are removed and unlimited height limits are introduced.	Accept.	Yes
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.181	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Considers that maintaining the height limits within the City Centre Zone is not justified. The City Centre Zone is intended to be the 'beating heart' of Wellington City and to permit the highest level of density. The height limits restrict options for developers and make it harder to deliver quality developments which appropriately respond to the site. All significant development within the City Centre Zone is a restricted discretionary activity, allowing Council significant input and the means to ensure only quality developments are granted consent. That discretion provides a sufficient level of protection. Height limits also risk creating a 'flat haircut' type city, rather than one that contains a diversity of buildings.	Delete CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) in its entirety. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.182	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Submitter opposes CCZ-S1 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specifying height limits is an unnecessary constraint on development and is inconsistent with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) which requires district plans to “enable, in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible” (Policy 3). - The building height limits artificially inflate height over other design considerations when assessing the merits of a proposal such as effects on wind and sunlight, potentially to the detriment of overall design excellence. - The requirement to comply with other objective performance criteria such as overshadowing, daylight access, protected view shafts and wind sufficiently contain the environmental impact of subject developments without the further imposition of height constraints. - The building height limits do not allow for a diversity of height within the CCZ, which we consider contributes to a more engaging urban form and allows for better design and urban outcomes. - In any case, the heights currently specified provide a false sense of future development within the city centre as they do not affect activity status (restricted discretionary) and can be extended through, for example, application of the City Outcomes Contributions. 	Delete CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.183	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Submitter opposes CCZ-S1 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specifying height limits is an unnecessary constraint on development and is inconsistent with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) which requires district plans to “enable, in city centre zones, building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible” (Policy 3). - The building height limits artificially inflate height over other design considerations when assessing the merits of a proposal such as effects on wind and sunlight, potentially to the detriment of overall design excellence. - The requirement to comply with other objective performance criteria such as overshadowing, daylight access, protected view shafts and wind sufficiently contain the environmental impact of subject developments without the further imposition of height constraints. - The building height limits do not allow for a diversity of height within the CCZ, which we consider contributes to a more engaging urban form and allows for better design and urban outcomes. - In any case, the heights currently specified provide a false sense of future development within the city centre as they do not affect activity status (restricted discretionary) and can be extended through, for example, application of the City Outcomes Contributions. 	Seeks that as an alternative to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) maximum heights, floor area ratios relative to lot sizes could be used as a method to control bulk and calculated based on the heights currently allowed. Submitter considers that this would enable more holistic design outcomes that prioritise performance outcomes as opposed to arguably arbitrary height limits.	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.184	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Submitter considers that if height limits are retained, there should be further scope for development above the façade height, e.g. plant rooms, sloping roofs, etc. It is the view from the street which is the greatest concern (i.e. the height of the parapet). The way the current height limits are drafted encourages a ‘flat haircut’ style of building and limits potential roof designs [Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Submitter seeks that if CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) height limits are retained, that CCZ-S1 be amended as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>This standard does not apply to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 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; and b. Lift overruns provided these do not exceed the height by more than 4m. c. Circumstances where up to 50% of a building’s roof in elevation exceeds the maximum height where the entire roof slopes 15° or more; or d. Circumstances where, in respect of flat roofs or roofs sloping less than 15°, non-habitable rooms (such as plant rooms) and other roof-top structures may exceed the height, provided those structures are set back from the leading edge of the parapet by at least 2 metres and do not exceed 50% of the overall roof area. e. ... <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.185	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers for the Wellington Train Station Precinct that intensification should be most prevalent where major existing public infrastructure is available, particularly public transport.</p> <p>Submitter considers to that end, building height limits (not withstanding earlier comments regarding height limits in general) around the Train Station should be maximised.</p> <p>Submitter notes the 50m height limit above the rail corridor enabling a potential over-station development – the submitter strongly supports this initiative and believe even further height is warranted here. This height should be extended to nearby sites including the station itself, and around Thorndon Quay, Waterloo Quay and Lambton Quay – the majority of which is currently constrained to between 27m and 40m.</p> <p>The submitter believes there are sufficient other controls in place to manage responsible use of height.</p>	Seeks that for the Wellington Train Station precinct CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) be amended, notwithstanding the submitters other comments regarding height controls, to increase the height limit above the rail corridor to the extent possible and ensure the height limit of nearby areas is at a similar scale.	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.186	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that for the Tasman Street block, that the block bounded by Buckle Street, Tasman Street, Rugby Street and Sussex Street appears as an anomaly (28.5m) to the height limits of the similarly zoned blocks immediately to the north (42.5m) and to the south (42.5m).</p> <p>Submitter considers that it is clear that 28.5m is utilised as a transitional height from the 42.5m zone to the lower 21m and 11m height limits, however it is unclear what justification there is for the anomaly on this block given the intensification of the entire Adelaide Road precinct immediately south, and the Te Aro precinct immediately north.</p>	Seeks that the Tasman Street block CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) be amended, notwithstanding the submitters other comments regarding height controls, to increase the height limit of the Tasman Street block to be consistent with the surrounding blocks, and consistent with the intent of the NPSUD.	Reject.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.81	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	<p>Seeks amendments to CCZ-S1 to provide unlimited building heights in the City Centre zone as it applies to the “High City” area that was identified in the Wellington Spatial Plan (centred on Lower Willis Street/Boulcott Street/The Terrace/Featherston Street/Lambton Quay/Customhouse Quay), and as it applies to properties at 22 The Terrace, 1 Grey Street, 20 Customhouse Quay, and 215 Lambton Quay.</p> <p>Policy 3 of the NPS-UD requires district plans of Tier 1 urban environments such as Wellington to enable “building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification” in city centre zones. We interpret this to mean that the City Centre, or at minimum parts of the City Centre, should have no maximum building heights.</p> <p>Unlimited building heights in the central City Centre area are appropriate given the emphasis in the Wellington Spatial Plan and Proposed Plan on the City Centre for accommodating future growth, recognising the height of existing buildings in these areas, and taking into account the absence of any directly adjoining residential areas that could potentially be adversely affected. This would also be consistent with CCZ-P5 which recognises the benefits of enabling greater height and scale of development in the City Centre.</p> <p>According to CCZ-O1 the Wellington City Centre is intended to be the primary commercial centre for the wider Wellington region. Yet the intensification planning instruments notified in Hutt City and Upper Hutt City provide for a greater scale of development than Wellington City with unlimited heights in their centres. Unlimited building heights in the Wellington City Centre would be consistent with its role as the primary commercial centre for the region.</p>	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) with respect to the imposition of height limits in the City Centre Zone	Accept in part.	Yes
Wellington Civic Trust	F583.1	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS1	Oppose	The submission seeks unlimited building heights in part of the City Centre Zone. It is not clear to what extent this would capture precincts and other valued areas including viewshafts and protected sunlight areas. Wellington Civic Trust does not support this notion.	Disallow	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Fabric Property Limited	425.82	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Seeks amendments to CCZ-S1 to provide unlimited building heights in the City Centre zone as it applies to the “High City” area that was identified in the Wellington Spatial Plan (centred on Lower Willis Street/Boulcott Street/The Terrace/Featherston Street/Lambton Quay/Customhouse Quay), and as it applies to properties at 22 The Terrace, 1 Grey Street, 20 Customhouse Quay, and 215 Lambton Quay.</p> <p>Policy 3 of the NPS-UD requires district plans of Tier 1 urban environments such as Wellington to enable “building heights and density of urban form to realise as much development capacity as possible, to maximise benefits of intensification” in city centre zones. We interpret this to mean that the City Centre, or at minimum parts of the City Centre, should have no maximum building heights.</p> <p>Unlimited building heights in the central City Centre area are appropriate given the emphasis in the Wellington Spatial Plan and Proposed Plan on the City Centre for accommodating future growth, recognising the height of existing buildings in these areas, and taking into account the absence of any directly adjoining residential areas that could potentially be adversely affected. This would also be consistent with CCZ-P5 which recognises the benefits of enabling greater height and scale of development in the City Centre.</p> <p>According to CCZ-O1 the Wellington City Centre is intended to be the primary commercial centre for the wider Wellington region. Yet the intensification planning instruments notified in Hutt City and Upper Hutt City provide for a greater scale of development than Wellington City with unlimited heights in their centres. Unlimited building heights in the Wellington City Centre would be consistent with its role as the primary commercial centre for the region.</p>	Amend CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) to remove all height limits and provide unlimited building heights in the High City areas.	Accept in part.	Yes
Wellington Civic Trust	F583.2	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS1	Oppose	The submission seeks unlimited building heights in part of the City Centre Zone. It is not clear to what extent this would capture precincts and other valued areas including viewshafts and protected sunlight areas. Wellington Civic Trust does not support this notion.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Reading Wellington Properties Limited	441.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose	Opposes CCZ-S1 as Reading Wellington Properties Limited is in the process of developing a masterplan for all of its properties in Wellington, with high design thresholds. Given the sites prominence, the design should not be constrained by a permitted height limit.	Delete CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Chrissie Potter	446.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>Considers that standard is contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the District Plan relating to amenity, design adverse effects and heritage.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m.	Accept – 15m height recommended	Yes.
Chrissie Potter	446.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>Considers that standard is contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the District Plan relating to amenity, design adverse effects and heritage.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows:</p> <p><u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u></p> <p>[refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11]</p>	Accept – 15m height recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Dorothy Thompson	449.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>Considers that standard is contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the District Plan relating to amenity, design adverse effects and heritage.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Opposes CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) - Height Control Area 9, South-east, South-west zone edge height limit of 28.5m.	Accept – 15m height recommended	Yes.
Dorothy Thompson	449.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S1	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, in particular Height Control Area 9 would allow an inappropriate scale of development adjacent to which is zoned for residential purposes and has a character or heritage overlay.</p> <p>Considers that standard is contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the District Plan relating to amenity, design adverse effects and heritage.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Seeks that a new height control area be added to CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>k. Height Control Area 11 - Eastern side of Hania Street 15m.</u></p> <p>[refer to submission for illustration of area covered by proposed height control area 11]</p>	Accept – 15m height recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	233.25	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S2	Support	Supports CCZ-S2 (Height Controls) around Old St Pauls Church.	Retain Height Controls around Old St Paul’s Church, Mulgrave Street as notified.	Accept.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.96	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS2	Support	Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings 10min walkable catchment Specific heritage identification and assessment Views contributing to sense of place and identity Extend Character Precincts per Boffa Miskell Boffa Miskell streetscapes Appropriate protection of pre-1930s buildings CCZ encroachment on residential zones Old St Pauls height controls Preserve viewshalfs	Allow	Accept.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.22	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S2	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-S2 (Old St Paul's Church - Adjoining site specific building height)	Accept.	No.
Stratum Management Limited	249.34	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S2	Support	Supports the imposition of a minimum height standard.	Retain standard CCZ-S2 (Minimum height) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Juliet Cooke	68.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	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. Considers that proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development. Moir Street will be impacted. 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]	Amend CCZ-S3.1 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned Areas...) as follows: 1. Identified character... a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct, and b. For any site adjoining a site identified within the MRZ within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than <u>15m</u> .	Accept in part – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Tracey Paterson	74.5	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose	Opposes CCZ-S3 as currently drafted. CCZ-S1 will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design. Moir Street is unique due to its classification as MRZ, Character Precinct, Heritage Area and adjacency to CCZ. As currently drafted, the standards of the proposed plan will allow buildings of up to 28.5m high to tower over 1-2 story heritage cottages on Moir St. The proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation. The Standards of the CCZ proposed Plan will lead to significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development with a direct impact on residential properties that have recognised heritage and character values on Moir Street. The standards will result in outcomes that are contrary to the objectives and policies of the PDP (CCZ)	Reject CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as notified.	Accept in part	No
Tracey Paterson	74.6	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Amend CCZ-S3 to set a more appropriate recession plane provision between the CCZ and MRZ.	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct. b. For any site adjoining a site identified within the Medium Density Residential Zone within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than <u>15m</u> .	Accept in part – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
James and Karen Fairhall	160.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>Considers that the 8m height and 60 degree recession planes in CCZ-S3 is not enough to prevent a devastating dominance over Moir Street's little one to two storey 1880s cottages. The shading effects will be substantial.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>	Accept in part – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
James and Karen Fairhall	160.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>Considers that the 8m height and 60 degree recession planes in CCZ-S3 is not enough to prevent a devastating dominance over Moir Street's little one to two storey 1880s cottages. The shading effects will be substantial.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. ... 2. <u>For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u> ...</p>	Reject.	No.
James and Karen Fairhall	160.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to introduce a 5m setback with a 4m height limit within that setback so that building mass, and thus dominance, is not on the boundary of a residential property.</p> <p>Considers that the 8m height and 60 degree recession planes in CCZ-S3 is not enough to prevent a devastating dominance over Moir Street's little one to two storey 1880s cottages. The shading effects will be substantial.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. ... 3. <u>For any site adjoining a site identified within Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: The first 5 metres back from the boundary must not exceed 4m (one storey).</u></p>	Reject.	No.
James and Karen Fairhall	160.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>	Accept – 5m recommended Hania Street	Yes.
James and Karen Fairhall	160.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design): CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7. CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. and CCZ-O7.2.e. CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.a.ii. and CCZ-P9.2.a.iii. CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2. MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts). HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Accept in part	No.
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) .</p>	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>	Accept – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. ... 2. <u>For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u> </p>	Reject.	No.
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to introduce a 5m setback with a 4m height limit within that setback so that building mass, and thus dominance, is not on the boundary of a residential property.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. ... 3. <u>For any site adjoining a site identified within Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: The first 5 metres back from the boundary must not exceed 4m (one storey).</u></p>	Reject.	No.
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Supports the report 'Planning for residential amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>	Accept – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Karen and Jeremy Young	162.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design): CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7. CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. to CCZ-O7.2.e. CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2. CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2. MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts). HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Accept in part	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-53	Oppose in part	Considers that CCZ-53 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes CCZ-53 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) .	Reject.	No.
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-53	Amend	Considers that CCZ-53 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct. The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street. The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend CCZ-53 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.	Accept – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-53	Amend	Considers that CCZ-53 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct. The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street. The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend CCZ-53 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows (add Point 2): 1. ... <u>2. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u> ...	Reject.	No.
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-53	Amend	Considers that CCZ-53 should be amended to introduce a 5m setback with a 4m height limit within that setback so that building mass, and thus dominance, is not on the boundary of a residential property. The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street. The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend CCZ-53 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows (add Point 3): 1. ... <u>3. For any site adjoining a site identified within Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: The first 5 metres back from the boundary must not exceed 4m (one storey).</u>	Reject.	No.
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-53	Amend	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.	Amend CCZ-53 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.	Accept – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Kane Morison and Jane Williams	176.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design): CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7.</p> <p>CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. to CCZ-O7.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Accept in part	No.
Athena Papadopoulos	183.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height).	Reject.	No.
Athena Papadopoulos	183.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas:</p> <p>a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>	Accept – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Athena Papadopoulos	183.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows (add Point 2):</p> <p>1. ...</p> <p>2. <u>For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u></p> <p>...</p>	Reject.	No.
Athena Papadopoulos	183.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Supports the report 'Planning for residential amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas:</p> <p>a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>	Accept – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Athena Papadopoulos	183.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design): CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7.</p> <p>CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. to CCZ-O7.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-01 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Accept in part.	No.
Lara Bland	184.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height).	Reject.	No.
Lara Bland	184.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas:</p> <p>a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>	Accept – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Lara Bland	184.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows (add Point 2):</p> <p>1. ...</p> <p>2. <u>For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u></p> <p>...</p>	Reject.	No.
Lara Bland	184.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Supports the report 'Planning for residential amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas:</p> <p>a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>	Accept – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Lara Bland	184.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design): CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7.</p> <p>CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. to CCZ-O7.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Accept in part	No.
Geoff Palmer	188.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) .	Reject.	No.
Geoff Palmer	188.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas:</p> <p>a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>	Accept – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Geoff Palmer	188.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows (add Point 2):</p> <p>1.</p> <p>...</p> <p>2. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</p> <p>...</p>	Reject.	No.
Geoff Palmer	188.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Supports the report 'Planning for residential amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas:</p> <p>a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>	Accept – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Geoff Palmer	188.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3, and CCZ-S11 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design): CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7.</p> <p>CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. to CCZ-O7.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Accept in part	No.
Dougal and Libby List	207.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) .	Reject.	No.
Dougal and Libby List	207.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas:</p> <p>a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>	Accept – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Dougal and Libby List	207.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. ...</p> <p><u>b. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u></p> <p>...</p>	Reject.	No.
Dougal and Libby List	207.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to introduce a 5m setback with a 4m height limit within that setback so that building mass, and thus dominance, is not on the boundary of a residential property.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. ...</p> <p><u>c. For any site adjoining a site identified within Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: The first 5 metres back from the boundary must not exceed 4m (1 story).</u></p> <p>...</p>	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Dougal and Libby List	207.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m 5m above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.	Accept – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Dougal and Libby List	207.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3, and CCZ-S11 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below: CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design) as follows: CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7. CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. to CCZ-O7.2.e. CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as follows: CCZ-P9.2. CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2. MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts). HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage). PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as proposed by this submission. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject.	No.
Craig Forrester	210.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	Considers that CCZ-S3 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development. Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Craig Forrester	210.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct. Considers that the currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street. Considers that adverse effects will result including: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts. Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m 5m above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.	Accept – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Craig Forrester	210.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct. Considers that the currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street. Considers that adverse effects will result including: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. ... 2. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m. ...	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Craig Forrester	210.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to introduce a 5m setback with a 4m height limit within that setback so that building mass, and thus dominance, is not on the boundary of a residential property.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. ...</p> <p>3. For any site adjoining a site identified within Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: The first 5 metres back from the boundary must not exceed 4m (one storey).</p>	Reject.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.23	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Support	<p>Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.</p>	Retain CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas - Adjoining the site specific building and structure height) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.325	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Support	<p>Supports the standard as the maximum height for any building is between 25m-93m</p>	Retain CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas - Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason].</p>	Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) .	Reject.	No.
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows:</p> <p>1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.</p>	Accept – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows (add Point 2):</p> <p>1. ...</p> <p>2. <u>For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u></p> <p>...</p>	Reject.	No.
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.12	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to introduce a 5m setback with a 4m height limit within that setback so that building mass, and thus dominance, is not on the boundary of a residential property.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows (add Point 3):</p> <p>1. ...</p> <p>3. <u>For any site adjoining a site identified within Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: The first 5 metres back from the boundary must not exceed 4m (one storey).</u></p>	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Supports the report 'Planning for Residential Amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'.	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.	Accept – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3, and CCZ-S11 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP relating to amenity, design adverse effects and heritage.	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as proposed by this submission. [[Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part	No.
Jane Szentivanyi	376.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	CCZ-S3 is opposed as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites. As currently drafted, CCZ-S11 will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties, as well as recognised heritage and character values which cannot be mitigated through design. As such, the provision is contrary to the objectives and policies of the plan.	Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Jane Szentivanyi	376.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and a maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any site in the MDZ which is a heritage area or character precinct.	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct. b. <u>For any site adjoining a site identified within the MDZ within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u>	Accept in part – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Christie Potter	446.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	Considers that CCZ-S3 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development. Considers that standard is contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the District Plan relating to amenity, design adverse effects and heritage. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height).	Reject.	No.
Christie Potter	446.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct. The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street. Considers that the significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.	Accept in part – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Christie Potter	446.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct. The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street. Considers that the significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows (add Point 2): 1. ... b. <u>For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u>	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Chrissie Potter	446.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Supports the report 'Planning for residential amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'. Considers that as Moir Street is also designated a heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Dorothy Thompson	449.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Oppose in part	Considers that CCZ-S3 will fail to manage significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development. Considers that standard is contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the District Plan relating to amenity, design adverse effects and heritage. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Opposes CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height).	Reject.	No.
Dorothy Thompson	449.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct. The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street. Considers that the significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct.	Accept in part – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Dorothy Thompson	449.9	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S3 should be amended to set a more appropriate recession plane and maximum height of 15m for any CCZ site adjacent to any heritage area or character precinct. The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street. Considers that the significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows (add Point 2): 1. ... b. <u>For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may be higher than 15m.</u>	Reject.	No.
Dorothy Thompson	449.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S3	Amend	Supports the report 'Planning for residential amenity' by Boffa Miskell as it relates to its recommendation for all character areas to have a '5m boundary height limit with a 60 degree recession plane for ANY zone adjoining a character area'. Considers that as Moir Street is also designated a heritage area, it should have even more importance placed on mitigating the impacts of development from adjoining sites. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend CCZ-S3 (Character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas – Adjoining site specific building and structure height) as follows: 1. Identified character precincts and Residentially Zoned heritage areas: a. For any site adjoining a site identified within a Character Precinct or a Residentially Zoned Heritage Area: no part of any building, accessory building or structure may project beyond a line of 60° measured from a height of 8m <u>5m</u> above ground level from all side and rear boundaries that adjoin that precinct. [Inferred decision requested].	Accept in part – 5m recommended for Hania Street	Yes.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.54	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Oppose	Opposes CCZ-S4 as it may be appropriate and necessary to provide building heights less than 22m in certain areas and the standard is seen as unnecessarily constraining.	Delete CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.164	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS4	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to further submission]	Allow	Reject.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.24	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-S4 (Minimum building heights) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Wheeler Grace Trust	261.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that the proposed Height Controls in Selwyn Terrace are inappropriate. Supports the proposal that Selwyn Terrace is HRZ with 21m Height Control area. 6 Storey buildings would significantly detract from the residential amenity of Selwyn Terrace. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) so that Selwyn terrace, Thorndon does not have a 22m minimum building height.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
McDonald's	274.67	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Eldin Family Trust	287.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that regardless of the zoning applied to Selwyn Terrace a minimum building height of 22m or a maximum if either 21m or 27m would be inappropriate. Considers that these building heights are inconsistent with the Viewshafts VS1 (The Beehive) and VS4 (The Beehive and The Cenotaph – Whitmore Street) which would clash with the viewshaft. Considers that tall buildings in Selwyn Terrace would detract from the residential amenity, special character and heritage of Selwyn Terrace and increase pressure on access, parking and turning. Considers that developers would face difficulty in complying with the minimum height requirements due to covenants on titles. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Opposes CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) with respect to Selwyn Terrace (and the nearby areas of Hill Street and Guildford Terrace) being subject to the 22m minimum height control (Height control area 3).	Reject.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.198	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Oppose	Oppose There are many buildings with a height less than the required minimum that will contribute positively to a well-functioning urban environment. The proposed standard will result in too many buildings requiring resource consent and is not an efficient or effective method to implement the policies of the Proposed District Plan.	Delete CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.66	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS4	Support	Submission point 349.198 supports FSNI submission point 476.57.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Woolworths New Zealand	359.90	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Amend	CCZ-S4 should be amended to exclude supermarkets, as this is an overly onerous standard when the PDP should be promoting development in the Centres. The standard could also be refined to be a building frontage height standard and limited to specified streets as identified on the planning maps to achieve centre vibrancy and amenity.	Amend CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) as follows: 1. A minimum height of 22m is required for new buildings or structures. This standard does not apply to: 1. Any site adjoining a site located within a character precinct or Residentially Zoned Heritage Area and thus subject to CCZ-S3; and 2. Any site within the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct. 3. Any new supermarket building	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.25	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Support	Submission point 359.90 CCZ-S4 has similar outcome to FSNI submission point 476.57.	Allow / Allow submission if submission point 476.57 is rejected.	Reject.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.121	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Support in part	CCZ-S4 is supported in so much as it seeks to enable a higher density of activities in the CC by enabling buildings of greater heights than other zones. This standard applies to every new 'building' or 'structure', which are both defined in the PDP and essentially includes any physical object that is fixed to the ground with no qualifying dimensions.	Retain CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.122	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S4 should include an exclusion for any building or structure which is unable to be occupied. The intent of this rule is to relate to occupiable buildings rather than any structure that may be fixed to the ground (e.g. sign, pole, box, above ground water tanks, rubbish bins or compounds), which is unlikely to meet this 22m height requirement often for operational and functional necessity and triggers resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity. It is acknowledged that the assessment criteria requires consideration of any functional or operational need for a reduction in height. However, it is considered that an additional exclusion be included for ancillary structures that are not intended to be roofed or occupied by people.	Amend CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: 1. Any site adjoining a site located within a character precinct or Residentially Zoned Heritage Area and thus subject to CCZ-S3; and 2. Any site within the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct 3. Any ancillary building or structure unable to be occupied by people.	Reject.	No.
U.S. Embassy Wellington	366.4	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Oppose	Concerned about the minimum building height requirement of 21m in the City Centre zone around the United States Embassy for security reasons.	Amend the minimum building height standard CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) so that it does not apply to sites surrounding the United States Embassy as identified on a map provided. [[Inferred decision requested]] [See original submission for map]	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.30	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS4	Support	The US Embassy is City Centre Zone. Immediately east of the Embassy are superior quality character and heritage residential properties. The TRA seeks a change from the HDRZ proposed to a MDRZ for the Hobson precinct situated east of the Embassy.	Allow	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.120	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Amend	Opposes the proposed minimum building height of 22m. Appreciates that the intention of this standard is to ensure new development in the CBD realises as much development capacity as possible, in accordance with NPS-UD. However, it may not be possible or practical for temporary buildings on sites (such as containers or temporary offices) to reach the minimum building height of 22m. However, there is still a functional need for such buildings to be located in the City Centre on a temporary basis, and it would be inappropriate and potentially onerous to obtain a discretionary resource consent in every situation where a temporary building or structure below 22m is to be erected in the City Centre zone. Therefore, Argosy seeks an exception to Standard CCZ-S4 in relation to temporary buildings. Argosy supports the assessment criteria where the standard is infringed to include recognising that a reduced height may be necessary to provide for the functional or operational needs of a proposed activity, or due to topographical or other site constraints	Amend CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height): This standard does not apply to temporary buildings and structures.	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.67	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS4	Support	Submission point 383.120 partly supports FSNI submission point 476.57.	Allow / Allow submission in part.	Accept.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.34	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Support	CCZ-S4 is supported as it excludes buildings and structures in the Te Ngākau Civic Square Precinct from the minimum height of buildings standard.	Retain CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.187	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Support	Supports CCZ-S4 in part. Submitter is generally supportive of requiring sufficiently dense development within the CCZ, it should be acknowledged that 6 storeys will not always be appropriate for every site.	Retain CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) with amendment.	Accept.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.102	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Oppose	Submission point 416.187 seeks to amend CCZ-S4. FSNI submission point 476.57 seeks to delete CCZS4 in its entirety.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.188	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Amend	Submitter considers that while they are generally supportive of requiring sufficiently dense development within the CCZ, it should be acknowledged that 6 storeys will not always be appropriate for every site.	Seeks that for CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) Council should consider reducing the height limit.	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.189	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Amend	Submitter considers that while they are generally supportive of requiring sufficiently dense development within the CCZ, it should be acknowledged that 6 storeys will not always be appropriate for every site.	Seeks that for CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) Council should consider amending the standard to provide clarity on the factors which will be considered if the minimum building height is not achieved (e.g. quality urban design outcome).	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.57	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S4	Oppose	Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete CCZ-S4 (Minimum building height) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.55	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S5	Oppose	Opposes CCZ-S5 as it may be appropriate to provide ground floor heights lower than 4m in certain areas and the standard is seen as unnecessarily constraining.	Delete (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.25	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S5	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-S5 (Minimum ground floor height) as notified.	Accept in part – minor and inconsequential amendments.	No.
Stratum Management Limited	249.35	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S5	Support in part	Supports the proposed minimum 4m ground floor height as it applies to non-residential buildings. Considers that for residential apartment buildings the 4m ground floor height is not required, serves no useful purpose, and imposes additional construction costs and therefore increases apartment prices. Considers that while conversion of commercial buildings to residential use is often feasible, it is rare that a residential building can be converted to commercial use and therefore a 4m ground floor height is less appropriate for residential buildings.	Retain CCZ-S5 (Minimum ground floor height) subject to amendment.	Reject.	No.
Stratum Management Limited	249.36	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S5	Amend	Supports the proposed minimum 4m ground floor height as it applies to non-residential buildings. Considers that for residential apartment buildings the 4m ground floor height is not required, serves no useful purpose, and imposes additional construction costs and therefore increases apartment prices. Considers that while conversion of commercial buildings to residential use is often feasible, it is rare that a residential building can be converted to commercial use and therefore a 4m ground floor height is less appropriate for residential buildings.	Amend CCZ-S5 (Minimum ground floor height) as follows: The minimum ground floor height to <u>the underside of a structural slab or equivalent shall be:</u> 1. <u>For non-residential and mixed use buildings - 4m.</u> 2. <u>For residential buildings - 3m.</u>	Reject.	No.
McDonald's	274.68	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S5	Oppose	Considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete CCZ-S5 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.199	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S5	Oppose	Opposed to the minimum floor-to-floor ceiling heights for new development. The standard is overly prescriptive, does not provide for the specific requirements of drive-through facilities, and is unworkable from an operational perspective, and will only serve to increase the cost and/or regulatory processes of the development.	Delete CCZ-S5 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Foodstuffs North Island	F523.68	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ55	Support	Submission point 349.199 supports FSNI submission point 476.58.	Allow	Accept.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.83	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-55	Oppose	Opposes CCZ-55 and seeks its deletion. Considers that it may be appropriate to provide ground floor heights lower than 4 metres in certain areas and that the standard as notified is unnecessarily constraining.	Delete CCZ-55 (Minimum Ground Floor Heights) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.58	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-55	Oppose	Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on minimum building height and minimum ground floor height are unnecessary and would be more appropriate to have within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Delete CCZ-55 (Minimum ground floor height) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Wellington City Youth Council	201.37	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-56	Support	Supports maintaining the protection of sunlight access to listed public space in City Centre, including increasing the number of protected parks.	Retain CCZ-56 (Minimum sunlight access - public space) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.26	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-56	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-56 (Minimum sunlight access - public space) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Khoi Phan	326.41	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-56	Oppose	Considers that minimum sunlight requirement will further restrict our housing need. We are Wellington and now Whakatu Nelson.	Remove CCZ-56 (Minimum sunlight access – public space) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.200	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-56	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-56 (Minimum sunlight access – public space) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.735	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-56	Amend	Considers that CCZ-58 should be amended so that active frontage controls only apply where necessary, such as along principal roads/arterials not necessary along connecting streets. Only buildings that are located along any street edge should be controlled, rather than buildings on the whole site where an active frontage applies. Active frontage controls on streets and buildings where these matters do not apply should be deleted. These amendments recognise that active frontage controls are useful to achieve well-functioning urban environments where they are specifically applied on key roads where character and amenity values anticipated by underlying zoning are present.	Amend CCZ-58 (Active frontage control) to only apply for buildings that are located along principal roads/arterials and along any street edge.	Reject.	No.
Catherine Penetito	474.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-56	Amend	Considers that Pukeahu National War Memorial Park should have sunlight protection for the whole area if it is to be maintained and enhanced. The Hall of Memories, the Carillon and the old museum building are too important to be overshadowed by residential or other buildings.	Seeks that sunlight access must be maintained in a minimum of 80% of Pukeahu Park rather than the current 70% as specified in CCZ-56 (Minimum sunlight access - public space). [[Inferred decision requested].	Reject.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.27	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-57	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-57 (Verandahs) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.201	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-57	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-57 (Verandahs) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.123	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-57	Support in part	CCZ-57 is partially supported as relates to specific sites identified on the Planning Maps with a 'verandah control'.	Retain CCZ-57 (Verandahs) with amendment.	Accept in part.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.124	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-57	Amend	Considers that CCZ-57 should be amended to have greater recognition of these existing activities and their operational and functional requirements that prevent compliance is needed, noting the investment associated with the existing commercial activities, the benefits they provide to the community and the need for them to be maintained and upgraded from time to time. It is sought that this standard not apply to buildings where there is functional requirement to not include a verandah. (Option A)	Amend CCZ-57 (Verandahs) as follows: 1. Verandahs must be provided on building elevations on identified street frontages <u>except where there is a functional requirement for a building to not contain a verandah.</u> ... ---	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Z Energy Limited	361.125	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S7	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S7 should be amended to have greater recognition of these existing activities and their operational and functional requirements that prevent compliance is needed, noting the investment associated with the existing commercial activities, the benefits they provide to the community and the need for them to be maintained and upgraded from time to time. It is sought that this standard not apply to service stations. (Option B)	Amend CCZ-S7 (Verandahs) as follows: ... This standard does not apply to: a. Any scheduled building identified in SCHED1 - Heritage Buildings; b. Any building where compliance with the standard results in an encroachment into the dripline of an existing street tree. c. <u>Service stations</u>	Accept in part.	Yes
Z Energy Limited	361.126	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S7	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S7 should be amended to have greater recognition of these existing activities and their operational and functional requirements that prevent compliance is needed, noting the investment associated with the existing commercial activities, the benefits they provide to the community and the need for them to be maintained and upgraded from time to time. It is sought that this standard recognise functional requirement in the assessment criteria. (Option C)	Amend CCZ-S7 (Verandahs) as follows: ... 1. The extent to which any non-compliance: a. Will adversely affect the comfort and convenience of pedestrians; b. Will result in further street trees being added to public space as part the development; and c. Is required for on-site functional or operational needs	Accept in part.	Yes
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.121	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S7	Amend	Supports that this standard would not apply where compliance would result in encroachment into the dripline of an existing tree, however there is a risk that referring to "street tree" would only include trees on berms or road reserves, and exclude existing trees on private property which still contribute to streetscape. Argosy proposes amending Standard CCZ-S7 to clarify that this standard would not apply where it would result in encroachment into the dripline of any tree that is to be retained	Amend CCZ-S7 (Verandahs) as follows: This standard does not apply to: ... Any building where compliance with the standard results in an encroachment into the dripline of an existing street -tree <u>that is to be retained</u> .	Reject.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.38	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S7	Support in part	Supports the overall requirement for verandahs within the central city especially the north-south corridors that channel the prevailing winds. These significantly reduce the less pleasant elements of the city's climate.	Retain CCZ-S7 (Verandahs) and extent as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.39	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S7	Oppose	Opposes the lack of verandahs along the east-west thoroughfares. These have the potential to enhance the experience of walking across the city under shelter.	Seeks that verandahs are installed over time along the south side "Active Frontages" of Tennyson, Lorne, and College Streets; and Jessie, Frederick, and Haining Streets.	Accept in part.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.40	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S7	Amend	Opposes the lack of verandahs along the east-west thoroughfares. These have the potential to enhance the experience of walking across the city under shelter.	Seeks that verandahs are installed over time along the south side "Active Frontages" of Tennyson, Lorne, and College Streets; and Jessie, Frederick, and Haining Streets.	Accept in part.	No.
Craig Palmer	492.41	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S7	Amend	Considers that to achieve sunlight illuminating the active frontages, verandahs need to have clear glazing out to the kerbside.	Seeks that verandahs are required to have clear glazing out to the kerbside.	Accept in part.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.56	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Amend	Supports CCZ-S8 in part and generally agrees with the intent of the standard, but considers that it provides insufficient exceptions for functional requirements such as vehicle entrances. Therefore seeks that the standard be amended so that only 70% of an active frontage must be built up to the street edge, in order to allow for functional requirements on the remaining 30% of the frontage.	Amend CCZ-S8 (Active frontage) as follows: ... a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full 70% of the width of the site boundary bordering any street boundary, subject to functional requirements.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Century Group Limited	238.28	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-S8 (Active frontage control) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
McDonald's	274.69	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Oppose in part	Supports certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed use zones the standards on active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls are overly prescriptive.	Retain CCZ-S8 (Active frontage controls), subject to amendment outlined other submission points.	Reject.	No.
McDonald's	274.70	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Amend	Considers that centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity. It would be more appropriate to streamline the standards with portions instead included within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.	Seeks that CCZ-S8 (Active frontage controls) is amended as follows: 1. Dwellings must not locate on the ground floor of Any new building or addition to an existing building on an identified street with an active frontage for any new building, or ground level addition or alteration to an existing building. must: a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary; b. Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; and c. Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary; 2. Any <u>new building or ground level addition to, or alteration of, a building or structure facing a public space must not result in a featureless façade that:</u> ...	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.181	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS8	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission. The RVA considers that residential activities, including retirement villages, should be permitted at ground floor.	Disallow	Accept.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.181	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS8	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman’s primary submission. Ryman considers that residential activities, including retirement villages, should be permitted at ground floor.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.202	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-S8 (Active frontage control) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.70	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS8	Oppose	Submission point 349.202 seeks to retain CCZ-S8 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.64 & 476.65 seek that CCZ-S8 is amended.	Disallow / Reject submission in part.	Reject.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.127	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Support in part	CCZ-S8 is partially supported as it requires that buildings are built up to the street edge along the full width of the site, that glazing is provided and that the principal entrance is located on the front road boundary.	Retain CCZ-S8 (Active frontage control) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.128	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S8 does not recognise the operational and functional requirements of existing service stations and should be amended. The following amendment is sought. (Option A)	Amend CCZ-S8 (Active frontage control) as follows: ... 2. Any new building or addition to an existing building adjoining an identified street with an active frontage control must: a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary <u>except where there is a functional requirement for that building to be set back from the street edge. In this case, 1b would not apply;</u> and b. Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; and c. Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary <u>except where there is a functional requirement for the principal entrance to not front the street.</u>	Reject.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.129	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Amend	Considers that CCZ-S8 does not recognise the operational and functional requirements of existing service stations and should be amended. The following amendment is sought. (Option B)	Amend CCZ-S8 (Active frontage control) as follows: ... Except: This does not apply to any heritage building identified in SCHED1-heritage buildings or <u>service stations;</u> and ...	Accept.	Yes.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.122	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Amend	Considers that standard CCZ-S8.1.a provides that any new building or addition to an existing building adjoining an identified street with an active frontage control must be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary. We considers that this control is overly restrictive and fails to recognise that there are robust reasons for a frontage to not be built up to the street edge along the full width of the site. For example, there may be a need for a vehicle or pedestrian entrance or public space.	Amend CCZ-S9.1 (Minimum residential unit size) as follows: a. Be built up to the street edge <u>on all street boundaries</u> and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary, <u>excluding vehicle and pedestrian access and public open spaces</u>	Accept in part.	Yes
Oyster Management Limited	404.81	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Oppose in part	Considers CCZ-S8 to be overly restrictive and fails to recognise there are reasons that a frontage may not be built to the street edge along the full width of the site, e.g. to provide for vehicle or pedestrian entrance, or public space.	Amend CCZ-S8 (Active frontage control) as follows: Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary, <u>excluding vehicle and pedestrian access and public open spaces;</u>	Accept in part.	Yes
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.71	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS9	Oppose	Submission point 404.81 seeks to amend CCZ-S9 in a way inconsistent with amendments proposed in FSNI submission point 476.64 & 476.65.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.82	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Amend	Considers CCZ-S8 to be overly restrictive and fails to recognise there are reasons that a frontage may not be built to the street edge along the full width of the site, e.g. to provide for vehicle or pedestrian entrance, or public space.	Amend CCZ-S8 (Active frontage control) as follows: Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary, <u>excluding vehicle and pedestrian access and public open spaces;</u>	Accept in part.	Yes
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.190	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Amend	Submitter considers that there should be more flexibility to breach the CCZ-S8 where the overall design has a positive effect on the streetscape.	Amend CCZ-S8 (Active frontage control) as follows: ... Assessment criteria where the standard is infringed: 1. The extent to which: a. Any non-compliance is required for on-site functional needs or operational needs; b. The building frontage is designed and located to create a strong visual alignment with adjoining buildings or otherwise enhances the streetscape; and ...	Accept in part.	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Fabric Property Limited	425.84	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Amend	<p>Considers that the properties at 1 Grey Street, 20 Customhouse Quay and 215 Lambton Quay are subject to the Active Frontage Control.</p> <p>Standard CCZ-S8.1.a provides that any new building or addition to an existing building adjoining an identified street with an active frontage control must be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary.</p> <p>Considers that this control is overly restrictive and fails to recognise that there are robust reasons for a frontage to not be built up to the street edge along the full width of the site. For example, there may be a need for a vehicle or pedestrian entrance or public space</p>	<p>Amend Standard CCZ-S9 as follows:</p> <p>1. ...</p> <p>a. Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary, excluding vehicle and pedestrian access and public open spaces;</p> <p>...</p>	Accept in part.	Yes
Foodstuffs North Island	476.64	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Oppose in part	<p>Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls are overly prescriptive.</p> <p>In FSNI's experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity.</p> <p>Considers that it would be more appropriate to streamline the standards with portions instead included within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.</p>	<p>Amend the CCZ-S8 (Active frontage control) as follows:</p> <p>1. Dwellings must not locate on the ground floor of Any new building or addition to an existing building an adjoining identified street with an active frontage control for any new building, or ground level addition or alteration to an existing building, must:</p> <p>a) Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary;</p> <p>b) Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; and</p> <p>c) Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary.</p> <p>Except that: This does not apply to any heritage building identified in SCHED1-heritage buildings; and 2. Any new building or ground level addition to, or alteration of, a building or structure facing a public space must not result in a featureless façade that: ...</p>	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.49	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS8	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. Ryman considers that residential activities, including retirement villages should be permitted at ground floor level.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.49	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS8	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. Ryman considers that residential activities, including retirement villages should be permitted at ground floor level.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.65	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S8	Amend	<p>Whilst supportive of certain bulk and location standards in the Commercial and Mixed Use zones, considers that the standards on active frontage and non-residential activity frontage controls are overly prescriptive.</p> <p>In FSNI's experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it is appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity.</p> <p>Considers that it would be more appropriate to streamline the standards with portions instead included within the Design Guidance and/or as matters of discretion.</p>	<p>Amend the CCZ-S8 (Active frontage control) as follows:</p> <p>1. Dwellings must not locate on the ground floor of Any new building or addition to an existing building an adjoining identified street with an active frontage control for any new building, or ground level addition or alteration to an existing building, must:</p> <p>a) Be built up to the street edge on all street boundaries and along the full width of the site bordering any street boundary;</p> <p>b) Provide a minimum of 60% of continuous display windows or transparent glazing along the width of the ground floor building frontage; and</p> <p>c) Locate the principal public entrance on the front boundary.</p> <p>Except that: This does not apply to any heritage building identified in SCHED1-heritage buildings; and 2. Any new building or ground level addition to, or alteration of, a building or structure facing a public space must not result in a featureless façade that: ...</p>	Reject.	No.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.50	Part 4 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS8	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	Accept.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.50	Part 4 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS8	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission. Ryman considers that residential activities, including retirement villages should be permitted at ground floor level.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.29	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential - unit size) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Stratum Management Limited	249.37	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Amend	Seeks that the minimum unit size for studio units is reduced to 30m2. Considers that Stratum has significant experience in the development of city centre residential buildings, including studio and dual key units. Stratum's model has been refined through significant experience and in Stratum's view a 30m2 studio unit can deliver successful outcomes. Stratum is not opposed to the other unit sizes specified.	<p>Amend CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential - unit size) as follows:</p> <p>Residential units, including any dual key units, must meet the following minimum sizes: a.</p> <p>Studio units 35m2</p> <p>b. 1 bedroom unit: 40m2</p> <p>c. 2+ bedroom unit: 55m2</p>	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Stratum Management Limited	249.38	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Support in part	Stratum is not opposed to the other unit sizes specified at CCZ-S9.	Retain CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential - unit size) with respect to 1 and 2+ bedroom unit sizes.	Accept in part.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.736	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Support in part	Supports this standard in part but seeks amendments to remove the minimum standard for 2+ bedroom units to enable greater design flexibility.	Retain CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential - unit size) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.737	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Amend	Supports this standard in part but seeks amendments to remove the minimum standard for 2+ bedroom units to enable greater design flexibility.	Amend CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential - unit size) as follows: Residential Unit Type: Minimum Net Floor Area b. Studio unit 30sm2 c. 1 or more bedroom unit 40m2 d. 2+ bedroom unit 55m2	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.191	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Oppose	Submitter is seeking fewer prescriptive standards. Submitter considers that Wellington needs to ensure that we are not unnecessarily preventing innovation by prescribing housing standards, such as minimum unit sizes and outdoor living space requirements (in particular, within the City Centre Zone). While the standards currently drafted will be appropriate for many uses, they may not suit everyone and they do not respond to emerging trends in apartment design. The standards also risk stifling affordable housing within the City Centre Zone by preventing more affordable building typologies.	Delete CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential – unit size) in its entirety. [Inferred decision requested].	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.151	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS9	Oppose	Considers the minimum unit standards support amenity values in the CCZ.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
LIVE WELLington	F596.47	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS9	Oppose	Minimum unit standards support amenity values in the CCZ.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.192	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Oppose	Opposes CCZ-S9 as the submitter considers: - Minimum residential unit sizes restrict the ability of developers to provide affordable housing choices and a diverse range of housing that meets market demands. - 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 do not reflect the policy in CCZ-P4 to offer a range of housing price, type, size and tenure.	Delete CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential – unit size) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.193	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Amend	Opposes MCZ-S7 as the submitter considers: - Minimum residential unit sizes restrict the ability of developers to provide affordable housing choices and a diverse range of housing that meets market demands. - 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 do not reflect the policy in CCZ-P4 to offer a range of housing price, type, size and tenure.	Seeks that if Council does decide to retain CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential – unit size) minimum residential unit sizes, it should be clearly defined that hotel accommodation, student accommodation and other similar accommodation types are distinct from residential unit sizes. The definition of residential units does not clearly exclude student accommodation and may render it subject to these minimum sizes.	Reject.	No.
Reading Wellington Properties Limited	441.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S9	Support	Supports the permitted apartment sizes in CCZ-S9.	Retain CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential – unit size) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Paul Burnaby	44.18	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S10	Amend	Considers that a provision should be made for 'juliet balconies' in CCZ-S10.	Add a provision in CCZ-S10 (Residential – outdoor living space) regarding 'juliet balconies'.	Reject.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.30	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S10	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-S10 (Residential - outdoor living space) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Stratum Management Limited	249.39	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S10	Oppose	<p>Considers that this standard requires that each residential unit must be provided with an outdoor living space of a minimum size, or that communal living space is provided. In an apartment context, private outdoor living space would be provided in the form of balcony space. There is no equivalent provision in the operative district plan. Stratum has developed various buildings, both with and without balcony space. Stratum’s experience suggests that balcony spaces are rarely used in Wellington, often become storage areas, and that they are generally incompatible with typical weather conditions. At a practical level, this requirement will impose additional costs on development. The requirement to provide a 5m2 balcony for an apartment will add an additional \$60,000 to the sale price for each apartment. For an 8m2 balcony, this costs will be in the order of \$100,000. For a typical building of some 100 units, this is a \$10M cost imposition. A communal open space of some 150m2 would add about \$2M of cost. These additional costs result directly from the construction cost of the additional floor area, noting that this is additional to the minimum unit size required by CCZ-S9 (Minimum residential - unit size). The requirement will have a significant and direct impact on housing affordability. The provision of communal open space will have a similar effect.</p> <p>Stratum’s recent development experience provides that the requirement is not necessary. The provision of Juliet balconies and fully openable sliding doors provide apartments with a strong connection to the outdoors. Moreover, the significant amenity provided within the public environment - public parks, the waterfront, Oriental Bay and Mt Victoria for instance - is a driving factor for the growth in central city residents.</p>	Remove standard CCZ-S10 (Residential - outdoor living space).	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.738	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S10	Oppose	Opposes this standard and considers the City Centre is a zone where it may be appropriate to develop residential units without outdoor living space given the access to public spaces and facilities.	Delete CCZ-S10 (Residential - outdoor living space) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Wellington’s Character Charitable Trust	FS82.141	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS10	Oppose	Considers that residential outdoor living space provides significant amenity value for residents. Considers it is not appropriate to assume that access to public spaces and facilities is a fair or adequate substitute.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.41	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS10	Oppose	Residential outdoor living space provides significant amenity value for residents. It is not appropriate to assume that access to public spaces and facilities is a fair substitute.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.40	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS10	Oppose	Residential outdoor living space provides significant amenity value for residents. It is not appropriate to assume that access to public spaces and facilities is a fair substitute.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.194	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S10	Oppose	<p>Submitter is seeking fewer prescriptive standards.</p> <p>Submitter considers that Wellington needs to ensure that we are not unnecessarily preventing innovation by prescribing housing standards, such as minimum unit sizes and outdoor living space requirements (in particular, within the City Centre Zone). While the standards currently drafted will be appropriate for many uses, they may not suit everyone and they do not respond to emerging trends in apartment design.</p> <p>The standards also risk stifling affordable housing within the City Centre Zone by preventing more affordable building typologies.</p>	<p>Delete CCZ-S10 (Residential - outdoor living space) in its entirety.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.195	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S10	Oppose	<p>Opposes CCZ-S10 as the submitter considers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minimum outdoor living space sizes restrict the ability of developers to provide affordable housing choices and a diverse range of housing that meets market demands. - 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 lack of outdoor living space are best dealt with by other legislation (e.g. Building Act 2004, Housing Improvement Regulations 1947, Residential Tenancies Act 1986). - Minimum outdoor living space sizes do not reflect the policy in CCZ-P4 to offer a range of housing price, type, size and tenure. 	Delete CCZ-S10 (Residential – outdoor living space) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Tracey Paterson	74.7	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Oppose	<p>Opposes CCZ-S11 as currently drafted.</p> <p>CCZ-S1 will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties which cannot be mitigated through design.</p> <p>Moir Street is unique due to its classification as MRZ, Character Precinct, Heritage Area and adjacency to CCZ. As currently drafted, the standards of the proposed plan will allow buildings of up to 28.5m high to tower over 1-2 story heritage cottages on Moir St. The proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation.</p> <p>The Standards of the CCZ proposed Plan will lead to significant adverse effects by allowing inappropriate, out of scale development with a direct impact on residential properties that have recognised heritage and character values on Moir Street.</p> <p>The standards will result in outcomes that are contrary to the objectives and policies of the PDP (CCZ)</p>	Reject CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as drafted.	Reject.	No.
Tracey Paterson	74.8	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	CCZ-S11 should be amended to ensure that the same expectations for separation of residential buildings that apply within a site also apply to adjacent residentially zoned sites.	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows:</p> <p>1. Any new building or addition to an existing building used for residential activities must provide a 8m separation distance between buildings located on the same site <u>and a 5m separation distance from any residential building on any adjoining residentially zoned site.</u></p>	Reject.	No.
Athena Papadopoulos	183.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S11 should be amended as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites.</p> <p>Considers that this should be amended to ensure that the same expectations for separation of residential buildings that apply within a site also apply to adjacent residentially zoned sites.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows:</p> <p>1. Any new building or addition to an existing building used for residential activities must provide a 8m separation distance between buildings located on the same site, <u>and a 5m separation distance from any residential building on any adjoining residentially zoned site,</u> as shown in Diagram 18 below.</p>	Reject.	No.
Athena Papadopoulos	183.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design): CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7.</p> <p>CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. to CCZ-O7.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Lara Bland	184.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S11 should be amended as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites.</p> <p>Considers that this should be amended to ensure that the same expectations for separation of residential buildings that apply within a site also apply to adjacent residentially zoned sites.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows:</p> <p>1. Any new building or addition to an existing building used for residential activities must provide a 8m separation distance between buildings located on the same site, and a 5m separation distance from any residential building on any adjoining residentially zoned site, as shown in Diagram 18 below.</p>	Reject.	No.
Lara Bland	184.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1 and CCZ-S3 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design): CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7.</p> <p>CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. to CCZ-O7.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject.	No.
Geoff Palmer	188.13	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S11 should be amended as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites.</p> <p>Considers that this should be amended to ensure that the same expectations for separation of residential buildings that apply within a site also apply to adjacent residentially zoned sites.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows:</p> <p>1. Any new building or addition to an existing building used for residential activities must provide a 8m separation distance between buildings located on the same site, and a 5m separation distance from any residential building on any adjoining residentially zoned site, as shown in Diagram 18 below.</p>	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Geoff Palmer	188.14	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3, and CCZ-S11 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design): CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7.</p> <p>CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. to CCZ-O7.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes): CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects): CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject.	No.
Dougal and Libby List	207.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S11 should be amended as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites.</p> <p>Considers that this should be amended to ensure that the same expectations for separation of residential buildings that apply within a site also apply to adjacent residentially zoned sites.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows:</p> <p>1. Any new building or addition to an existing building used for residential activities must provide a 8m separation distance between buildings located on the same site, and a 5m separation distance from any residential building on any adjoining residentially zoned site, as shown in Diagram 18 below.</p>	Reject.	No.
Dougal and Libby List	207.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3, and CCZ-S11 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP below:</p> <p>CCZ-O5 (Amenity and design) as follows: CCZ-O5.4. and CCZ-O5.7.</p> <p>CCZ-O7 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: CCZ-O7.1. and CCZ-O7.2.a. to CCZ-O7.2.e.</p> <p>CCZ-P9 (Quality design outcomes) as follows: CCZ-P9.2.</p> <p>CCZ-P12 (Managing adverse effects) as follows: CCZ-P12.1. and CCZ-P12.2.</p> <p>MRZ-PREC01-O1 (Character Precincts).</p> <p>HH-O2 (Protecting historic heritage).</p> <p>PART 2 - DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS - Strategic Direction - Urban Form and Development: The Plan also protects areas of special character in the City's inner suburbs. These suburbs are some of the City's original settlements, with pockets of relatively intact streetscape character derived from a range of factors such as building age, architectural style, and site boundary treatment. These are known as 'Character Precincts'. Rules in these Precincts control demolition and significant alterations and additions to buildings built before 1930.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.31	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Support	<p>Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.</p>	<p>Retain CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as notified.</p>	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.15	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S11 should be amended as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites.</p> <p>Considers that this should be amended to ensure that the same expectations for separation of residential buildings that apply within a site also apply to adjacent residentially zoned sites.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows:</p> <p>1. Any new building or addition to an existing building used for residential activities must provide a 8m separation distance between buildings located on the same site, and a 5m separation distance from any residential building on any adjoining residentially zoned site, as shown in Diagram 18 below.</p>	Reject.	No.
Moir Street Collective - Dougal List, Libby List, Karen Young, Jeremy Young, James Fairhall, Karen Fairhall, Craig Forrester, Sharlene Gray	312.16	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S1, CCZ-S3, and CCZ-S11 as proposed are contrary to the proposed objectives and policies of the PDP relating to amenity, design adverse effects and heritage.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as proposed by this submission.</p> <p>[Inferred decision requested].</p>	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.301	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Oppose in part	<p>Opposes the minimum building separation distance (being 8 m from any other building on the same site) for retirement villages as it would prevent linked buildings. Considers that the proposed matters of discretion for retirement villages are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) and seeks amendment.</p>	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.302	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Opposes the minimum building separation distance (being 8 m from any other building on the same site) for retirement villages as it would prevent linked buildings. Considers that the proposed matters of discretion for retirement villages are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows:</p> <p>1. ... [diagram] This standard does not apply to retirement villages.</p>	Reject.	No.
Jane Szentivanyi	376.10	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Oppose in part	<p>CCZ-S11 is opposed as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites. As currently drafted, CCZ-S11 will result in significant adverse effects on Moir Street properties, as well as recognised heritage and character values which cannot be mitigated through design. As such, the provision is contrary to the objectives and policies of the plan.</p>	<p>Opposes CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) and seeks amendment.</p>	Reject.	No.
Jane Szentivanyi	376.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S11 should be amended to ensure that the same expectations for separation of residential buildings that apply within a site also apply to adjacent residentially zoned sites.</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows:</p> <p>1. Any new building or addition to an existing building used for residential activities must provide a 8m separation distance between buildings located on the same site and a 5m separation distance from any residential building on any adjoining residentially zoned site, as shown in Diagram 18 below.</p> <p>...</p>	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.739	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Oppose	<p>Opposes this standard as considers it constrains design flexibility, and it is not clear what positive outcome it achieves.</p>	<p>Delete CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) in its entirety.</p>	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.142	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS11	Oppose	<p>Considers the CCZ-S11 standard supports amenity values in CCZ of reducing dominance, shading and privacy intrusion effects.</p>	Disallow	Accept.	No.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.42	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS11	Oppose	<p>The CCZ-S11 standard supports amenity values in CCZ of reducing dominance, shading and privacy intrusion effects.</p>	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.41	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS11	Oppose	<p>The CCZ-S11 standard supports amenity values in CCZ of reducing dominance, shading and privacy intrusion effects.</p>	Disallow	Accept.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Chrissie Potter	446.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S11 should be amended as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites.</p> <p>Considers that this should be amended to ensure that the same expectations for separation of residential buildings that apply within a site also apply to adjacent residentially zoned sites.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows:</p> <p>1. Any new building or addition to an existing building used for residential activities must provide a 8m separation distance between buildings located on the same site, and a 5m separation distance from any residential building on any adjoining residentially zoned site, as shown in Diagram 18 below.</p>	Reject.	No.
Dorothy Thompson	449.11	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S11	Amend	<p>Considers that CCZ-S11 should be amended as the proposed controls will fail to manage significant adverse effects on adjoining sites.</p> <p>Considers that this should be amended to ensure that the same expectations for separation of residential buildings that apply within a site also apply to adjacent residentially zoned sites.</p> <p>The currently proposed 60 degree recession plane from 8m will provide negligible mitigation from allowing buildings of up to 28.5m to tower over one-two storey heritage cottages on Moir Street.</p> <p>The significant adverse effects include: loss of sunlight, overlooking and loss of privacy, shading, increased wind, over-dominance of building form, loss of privacy, streetscape and urban design impacts.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reasons].</p>	<p>Amend CCZ-S11 (Minimum building separation distance) as follows:</p> <p>1. Any new building or addition to an existing building used for residential activities must provide a 8m separation distance between buildings located on the same site, and a 5m separation distance from any residential building on any adjoining residentially zoned site, as shown in Diagram 18 below.</p>	Reject.	No.
Precinct Properties New Zealand Limited	139.57	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Oppose	<p>Considers that this standard will act as a constraint on appropriate development and design, and it is not clear what positive outcome it achieves.</p>	Delete CCZ-S12 (Maximum building depth) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.32	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Support	<p>Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.</p>	Retain CCZ-S12 (Maximum building depth) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Stratum Management Limited	249.40	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Oppose	Considers that the standard appears to seek to address the creation of long and featureless building facades. This outcome would appear to be better addressed through design guidance (and associated discretion tied to the design guide) than through a standard. There are various design techniques that can address the issue that the standard is attempting to control.	Delete standard CCZ-S12 (Maximum building depth).	Reject.	No.
Restaurant Brands Limited	349.203	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Support	Support	Retain CCZ-S12 (Maximum building depth) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.81	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS12	Oppose	Submission point 349.203 seeks to retain CCZ-S12 as notified. FSNI submission point 476.101 seeks to delete CCZ-S12 in its entirety.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.303	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Oppose in part	Opposes the applicability of a maximum building depth standard for retirement villages. Considers that the proposed matters of discretion for CCZ-R19 and CCZ-R20 are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Opposes CCZ-S12 (Maximum building depth) and seeks amendment.	Reject.	No.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.304	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Amend	Opposes the applicability of a maximum building depth standard for retirement villages. Considers that the proposed matters of discretion for CCZ-R19 and CCZ-R20 are sufficient for assessing any effects relating to building lengths.	Amend CCZ-S12 (Maximum building depth) as follows: 1. ... [diagram] This standard does not apply to retirement villages.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.740	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Oppose	Opposes this standard as considers it constrains design flexibility, and it is not clear what positive outcome it achieves.	Delete CCZ-S12 (Minimum building depth) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.143	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS12	Oppose	Considers the CCZ-S12 standard supports amenity values in CCZ of reducing dominance.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.43	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS12	Oppose	The CCZ-S12 standard supports amenity values in CCZ of reducing dominance.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.42	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZS12	Oppose	The CCZ-S12 standard supports amenity values in CCZ of reducing dominance.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.196	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Oppose	Considers that maximum building depth is too restrictive and the submitter does not consider that it meets the section 32 Resource Management Act 1991 tests for appropriateness.	Delete CCZ-S12 (Maximum building depth) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.85	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Oppose	Opposes CCZ-S12, which sets a maximum building depth of 25m. This standard will act as a constraint on appropriate development and design, and it is not clear what positive outcome it achieves.	Delete CCZ-S12 (Maximum Building Depth) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.101	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S12	Oppose	Opposes the Centre standards which sets a maximum 25m continuous depth of any external side wall. The word "continuous" is defined as forming an unbroken whole, without being interrupted. It is unclear whether the standard would still apply if the side wall was modulated. It would appear that the intent of these standards relates to privacy and dominance effects on neighbours and preventing a long featureless building façade. Privacy and dominance effects are more appropriately dealt with via the height, height in relation to boundary and outlook space standards. Furthermore, any new building in a Centre zone that is visible from the public realm requires consent and consideration of objectives and policies that also address amenity and design. Considers that the standards on maximum building depth are unnecessary and will act as a constraint on appropriate development and design.	Delete CCZ-S12 (Maximum building depth) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.33	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S13	Support	Generally supports the balance of the standards that are proposed to apply to the City Centre Zone, subject to the specific relief sought in respect of the application of the Veranda and Active Frontages controls to the Property. The range of standards will effectively manage the design of development within the City Centre.	Retain CCZ-S13 (Outlook space) as notified.	Accept in part – amendments made in response to other submission points.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.741	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-S13	Oppose	Opposes this provision as considers it sets a standard that may not be possible to meet for dwellings that would otherwise provide a decent standard of living.	Delete CCZ-S13 (Outlook space) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.144	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ513	Oppose	Considers Kāinga Ora's submission provides no evidence or reassurance that residential units will inevitably achieve a decent standard of living without meeting this standard. Considers the PDP should not compromise the amenity value of providing "a decent standard of living".	Disallow	Accept.	No.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.44	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ513	Oppose	Kainga Ora's submission provides no evidence of reassurance that residential units will inevitably achieve a decent standard of living without meeting this standard. The PDP should not compromise the amenity value of providing "a decent standard of living".	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.43	Part 3 / Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ513	Oppose	Kainga Ora's submission provides no evidence of reassurance that residential units will inevitably achieve a decent standard of living without meeting this standard. The PDP should not compromise the amenity value of providing "a decent standard of living".	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Paul Burnaby	44.19	Commercial and mixed use Zones / City Centre Zone / CCZ-PREC01-S1	Support	Supports the Te Ngakau Civic Square Precinct provisions (precinct, objectives, policies, rules and standards), including the proposed 40m maximum height standard (CCZ-PREC01-S1) and request that the Council confirms those provisions.	Retain CCZ-PREC01-S1 precinct and associated provisions as notified.	Accept in part – changes to standard recommended to align with changes to CCZ-S1	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.33	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT	Oppose	Opposes defining 'Comprehensive Development' as a separate activity type from standalone houses or any other residential typology for the purposes of the zone rules and standards. Seeks deletion of this definition.	Delete the definition of 'Comprehensive Development'.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.59	Part 1 / Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT	Oppose	Considers this is an important term used throughout the plan and needs to be defined to provide clarity about what the planning rules mean.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
McDonald's	274.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	McDonald's is opposed to the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions and considers that developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their merits and effects. The merits of a proposal should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Remove all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed District Plan.	Accept – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.1	Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Oppose	Opposes this policy which requires some developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions in accordance with the Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide. This is because: - This provision elevates what is normally a design guide into a rule. A design guide should be separate to a plan. The Design Guide should be an external document to the District Plan and be referenced as a guide only. - Further, this provision, provides a mechanism for the Council to require these aspects as part of a development. This is inappropriate. A development should be assessed on its merits.	Delete all references to City Outcomes Contributions in the Proposed Plan.	Accept – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Foodstuffs North Island	FS23.29	Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Support	Submission point 383.1 supports FSNI submission point 476.1.	Allow	Accept – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.11	Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Amend	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission].	Remove reference of Comprehensive Development throughout the PDP.	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.5	Whole PDP / Whole PDP	Not specified	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks a thorough review of the City Outcomes Contribution process, to ensure developers receive certainty early on as to the additional height (or floor space) that will apply.	Accept – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Paul Burnaby	44.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that 110 Wakefield St (West Plaza Hotel) should have a maximum height of 73m to match the maximum height of the immediately adjoining building at 103 Wakefield St.	Amend height control at 110 Wakefield St (West Plaza Hotel) to 73m.	Reject.	No.
Dr Briar E R Gordon and Dr Lyndsay G M Gordon	156.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Opposes zone change of the area of Thorndon east of the motorway to City Centre Zone.	Reject zone change of the area of Thorndon east of the motorway to City Centre Zone and amend mapping.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.67	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	These submissions align with the Association's submissions for the Hobson precinct, the Portland/Hawkestone precinct, and the Selwyn precinct.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.198	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow	Reject.	No.
Andrew Flanagan	198.12	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Seeks that all height limits are removed on developments in the City Centre Zone.	Amend the mapping to remove all height limits on developments in the City Centre Zone.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Century Group Limited	238.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Opposes the imposition of a Veranda Control along the frontage of the Property and the other properties along the length of Waterloo Quay (northeast of Bunny Street). Considers that the pedestrian activity in the vicinity of the subject site is predominantly generated by the railway and the Wellington Regional Stadium. These are connected by a pedestrian bridge walkway, which also provides a sheltered pedestrian route at the ground level. Waterloo Quay is a vehicular route to the city, and there are no pedestrian-orientated activities fronting the road which would otherwise justify the need for veranda protection along the footpath. Does not consider that there is sufficient justification for imposing a costly requirement to provide veranda protection along the frontage of the Property, relative to the low level of pedestrian activity along the road, the alternative, protected pedestrian routes that exist between major pedestrian destinations, and the inconsistent application of the Veranda Control along Waterloo Quay.	Delete the 'Veranda' control as it relates to the land along both sides of Waterloo Quay, to the northeast of Bunny Street.	Reject.	No.
Century Group Limited	238.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the spatial extent of the 'Active Frontages' control as shown on the Map Viewer, insofar as the control does not apply to the Property. Considers that the relationship of the Property to the commercial core of the City Centre, and the 'utilitarian' characteristics of the Property and the surrounding land, are such that active building frontages would be an inappropriate and onerous imposition on the development of this land.	Retain the extent of the Active Frontages control as notified.	Accept.	Yes.
Alan Fairless	242.9	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that throughout the city are many sites that sit idle or underutilised. Developing these sites provides a means to addressing much of the future housing demand while avoiding adverse effects on quality, amenity and character. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that the District Plan sets out a clear sequence for intensification that focusses first on major areas of underutilised land and smaller groups of underutilised sites close to public transport, rather than upzoning broad areas of land.	Reject.	No.
Richard Murcott	322.7	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Supports zone change from CC2 to MRZ for the residential enclave of Selwyn Terrace.	Rezone Selwyn Terrace Street from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.42	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow	Reject.	No.
Richard Murcott	322.8	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Supports zone change from CC2 to MRZ for the residential area of Portland Crescent.	Rezone Portland Crescent from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.43	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow	Reject.	No.
Richard Murcott	322.9	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Supports zone change from CC2 to MRZ for the residential area of Hawkestone Street.	Rezone Hawkestone Street from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	F569.44	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	[Refer to Full Submission for reasons and examples of residential character of the Hobson precinct of Thorndon].	Allow	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave should be rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The enclave provides a visual linkage between this residential area and its residential neighbours across the motorway. It is part of the story of the Thorndon community demonstrating the impact the motorway construction had on Thorndon.	Seeks that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave and the Portland Crescent/Hawkestone St cluster not be classified as City Centre Zone, and be re-zoned back to Inner Residential Area, with a qualifying matter as a Character Precinct Area, in a manner consistent with the maps and information appended to the submission. [Refer to original submission]	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	F582.280	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.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	F511.179	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave should be rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The enclave provides a visual linkage between this residential area and its residential neighbours across the motorway. It is part of the story of the Thorndon community demonstrating the impact the motorway construction had on Thorndon.	Seeks that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave and the Portland Crescent/Hawkestone St cluster not be classified as City Centre Zone, and be re-zoned back to Inner Residential Area, with a qualifying matter as a Character Precinct Area, in a manner consistent with the maps and information appended to the submission. [Refer to original submission]	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.281	General / Mapping / 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.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.180	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association	333.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the Selwyn Terrace / Hill Street enclave should be rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The enclave provides a visual linkage between this residential area and its residential neighbours across the motorway. It is part of the story of the Thorndon community demonstrating the impact the motorway construction had on Thorndon.	Rezone the Portland Crescent / Hawkestone Street residential cluster from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.282	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.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.181	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow	Reject.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Seeks for the height limit of 7 Waterloo Quay to be increased to 60m. It is unclear why the height limit	Amend the building height limit of 7 Waterloo Quay to 60m.	Reject.	No.
Argosy Property No. 1 Limited	383.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Generally supports the height limits imposed on 143 Lambton Quay, 147 Lambton Quay, 15 Stout Street, 8 Willis Street and 360 Lambton Quay.	Retain the building height limits of 143 Lambton Quay, 147 Lambton Quay, 15 Stout Street, 8 Willis Street and 360 Lambton Quay as notified.	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.25	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Opposes the City Centre building height controls as notified and seeks that the building heights are simplified. Considers the Central Wellington City and the City Centre Zone should provide for unlimited building heights to encourage intensification and development. There are rules and standards in the District Plan that will control bulk, location and height of buildings in the city centre. Considers height should not be limited in the City Centre. Seeks simplification of the height controls.	Seeks to delete any mapping references to height limits in the CCZ.	Reject.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	FS84.23	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	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	FS96.4	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The submission to create unlimited building heights in the central city is opposed. A liveable city is about buildings of a human scale. It is unnecessary and undesirable in an earthquake prone city to allow skyscrapers.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Roland Sapsford	FS117.4	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	The submission to create unlimited building heights in the central city is opposed. A liveable city is about buildings of a human scale. It is unnecessary and undesirable in an earthquake prone city to allow skyscrapers.	Disallow	Accept in part.	No.
Guy Marriage	407.1	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the extension of the CCZ down Adelaide Road is flawed, as this is the lowers point on the path from Newtown to the Basis and is also the former boggy route of a wetland stream, so will be unsuitable for the creation of high rises.	Amend the mapping so that the City Centre Zone chapter is not extended along Adelaide Road.	Accept – Adelaide Road to be rezoned as Mixed Use Zone	Yes

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.7	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers for the Wellington Train Station Precinct that intensification should be most prevalent where major existing public infrastructure is available, particularly public transport.</p> <p>Submitter considers to that end, building height limits (not withstanding earlier comments regarding height limits in general) around the Train Station should be maximised.</p> <p>Submitter notes the 50m height limit above the rail corridor enabling a potential over-station development – the submitter strongly supports this initiative and believe even further height is warranted here. This height should be extended to nearby sites including the station itself, and around Thorndon Quay, Waterloo Quay and Lambton Quay – the majority of which is currently constrained to between 27m and 40m.</p> <p>The submitter believes there are sufficient other controls in place to manage responsible use of height.</p>	Seeks that for the Wellington Train Station precinct CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) be amended in the mapping.	Reject.	No.
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.8	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	<p>Considers that for the Tasman Street block, that the block bounded by Buckle Street, Tasman Street, Rugby Street and Sussex Street appears as an anomaly (28.5m) to the height limits of the similarly zoned blocks immediately to the north (42.5m) and to the south (42.5m).</p> <p>Submitter considers that it is clear that 28.5m is utilised as a transitional height from the 42.5m zone to the lower 21m and 11m height limits, however it is unclear what justification there is for the anomaly on this block given the intensification of the entire Adelaide Road precinct immediately south, and the Te Aro precinct immediately north.</p>	Seeks that the Tasman Street block CCZ-S1 (Maximum height) be amended in the mapping.	Reject.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.67	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the City Centre Zoning of New World Railway Metro (2 Bunny Street, Pipitea).	Retain the mapping of City Centre Zoning for New World Railway Metro (2 Bunny Street, Pipitea) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.68	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the City Centre Zoning of New World Willis Street Metro (70 Willis Street, Wellington Central).	Retain the mapping of City Centre Zoning for New World Willis Street Metro (70 Willis Street, Wellington Central) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Foodstuffs North Island	476.69	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the City Centre Zoning of New World Wellington City (279 Wakefield Street, Te Aro).	Retain the mapping of City Centre Zoning for New World Wellington City (279 Wakefield Street, Te Aro) as notified.	Accept.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Foodstuffs North Island	476.70	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Supports the City Centre Zoning of New World Thorndon (150 Molesworth Street).	Retain the mapping of City Centre Zoning for New World New World Thorndon (150 Molesworth Street) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Aro Valley Community Council	87.16	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers the site at 290 Willis Street should be rezoned from CCZ to MRZ at the site contains a listed heritage building.	Rezone 290 Willis Street from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept.	No.
Generation Zero	FS54.20	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.245	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.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.139	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or “heritage”) precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Aro Valley Community Council	87.17	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Amend the mapping so that 290, 292, 294, 296, 298, 300, 302, 304 and 306 Willis Street are within the MRZ.	Rezone 292, 294, 296, 298, 300, 302, 304 and 306 Willis Street from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Generation Zero	FS54.21	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	For character areas, the central test is “other” qualifying matter under clause 3.33(3) of the NPS-UD, alongside the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD. There is an extremely high bar to creating a character area. The reduction in development capacity must be justified against the national significance of urban development and the objectives of the NPS-UD. Cities are dynamic and changeable. Indeed Wellington underwent many built changes before the currently form was locked in place by modern zoning documents. New housing and residents are a positive to encourage, rather a negative to push out further or crowd into the remaining housing stock. It is significantly more climate friendly to allow denser housing in inner-suburbs, rather than displacing development into greenfields, even accounting for embodied carbon. Character areas are in inner-city suburbs which are highly connected to amenities and already have high-mode share of low emissions transport. This land is often the most resilient. More residents can be easily absorbed in these suburbs and will create a positive impact on that suburb. The counterfactual – the status quo – is that the best quality land in the city is locked away by wealthy residents who seek to preserve an unsustainable way of life and/or their property values. This causes reduced supply and higher prices, higher rents, lower quality, displacement of low-income residents, and pushes residents to worse locations with higher lifetime emissions. The development capacity lost through character areas is extremely weighty; only very ‘character’ of very high quality can be justified. It must also be a site-specific analysis; the current broadbrush suburb-by-suburb analysis in the current District Plan is not allowed. The approaches advocated by the submitters is erroneous under the NPS-UD and should be rejected. Submitters cannot point to individual streets or houses they subjectively find as ‘character’ as this does not meet the stringent evidential requirement of clause 3.33(3). Submitters cannot request to go back to the current District Plan character areas, as these are untenable under the new NPS-UD test. Submitters cannot point to the Boffa Miskel report and adopt its recommendation. The report was written before the enactment of the NPS-UD. And, crucially, this approach begs the question of how the report fits into the NPS-UD test in clause 3.33(3). The approach in the PDP, where only contiguous and coherent pockets of high-quality character are proposed, is legal under the NPS-UD.	Disallow / Disallow the submission in full to the extent that this relates to character areas or reducing the amount of enabled housing. Reject increasing character areas in the PDP.	Accept.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.246	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.
Alan Olliver & Julie Middleton	111.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the western edge of Mt Victoria should not be CCZ (City Centre Zone) Considers that CCZ is incompatible with various definitions of Mt Vic as a suburb. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend mapping so that the western edge of Mount Victoria that is within the CCZ (City Centre Zone) is rezoned to Medium Density Residential Area. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.198	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.
Jonathan and Tricia Briscoe	190.11	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the western edge of Mt Victoria should not be CCZ (City Centre Zone) Considers that CCZ is incompatible with various definitions of Mt Vic as a suburb. The current low-rise but historically dense residential area extends well into the area currently designated City Centre Zone and intended for building at least 10 storeys high. [refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend the mapping so that the western edge of Mount Victoria that is within the CCZ (City Centre Zone) is rezoned to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred Decision Requested].	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.189	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.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.118	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or “heritage”) precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Mount Victoria Historical Society	214.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Opposes the western edge of the legal suburb of Mt Victoria being included in the CCZ (City Centre Zone). Considers that Cambridge Terrace forms the logical eastern boundary of the CCZ. Considers that CCZ is incompatible with the current, historical, Wellington City Council and Geographic Board definition of Mount Victoria as a suburb. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	Seeks that the CCZ (City Centre Zone) east of Cambridge Terrace in Mount Victoria be rezoned to MRZ (Medium Density Residential Zone). [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.181	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.
Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities	FS89.96	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes this submission and reduction of the city centre zone.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.67	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	No specific reason provided.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.87	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that it is necessary to protect heritage values of Mt Victoria heritage area (curtilage).	Allow	Reject.	No.
Wheeler Grace Trust	261.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that the opportunity for residential intensification would be better reflected with HRZ (High Density Residential Zone). Changing from Inner Residential to City Centre Zone would drastically change Selwyn Terrace. Opposes the element of the NPS-UD application regarding commercial activities. Selwyn Terrace does not have a mix of land uses - it is all residential except the British High Commission, which has it's frontage on Hill Street. For Selwyn Terrace to be CCZ it would need better road access. Selwyn Terrace is unique and has character, making CCZ inappropriate. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Rezone Selwyn Terrace, Thorndon from CCZ (City Centre Zone) to HRZ (High Density Residential Zone).	Reject.	No.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.187	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow	Reject.	No.
Eldin Family Trust	287.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Oppose	Considers that the rezoning of Selwyn Terrace would be a dramatic change and would enable activities that conflict with the current primary use of Selwyn Terrace as a distinct enclave of residential dwellings. Considers that the Council is incorrect to say that Selwyn Terrace already has a mixture of land uses. Does not agree that a land use change is necessary to support a mixture of activities and growth, considering the street is very narrow and steep access, with a single carriageway for much of its length. A change to a commercial zoning would place unreasonable demand on vehicle and pedestrian access. Considers that Selwyn Terrace has a high concentration of pre-1930s character as evidenced by the 2019 Pre-1930s character area review report. Considers that 9 Selwyn Terrace is an excellent example of the work of one of Wellington's pre-eminent architects of the 20th Century, William Gray Young. Selwyn Terrace has special historic context as a reminder of the original suburb prior to the construction of the Wellington Motorway. Considers the plan provides sufficient development capacity without needing to change planning settings in Selwyn Terrace. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	Opposes the rezoning of Selwyn Terrace in the Operative District Plan from Inner Residential Zone to City Centre Zone in the Proposed District Plan.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.2	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	This is a significant small enclave of quality residential character dwellings in Thorndon. Selwyn Terrace has a special historic context as a residential area that reminds us of the original extent of the residential suburb.	Amend / Seeks that the submission be allowed and change Selwyn Terrace to Medium Density Residential Zone, and do this in harmony with the Portland residential enclave, and the Hobson residential precinct of Thorndon.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.289	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.
Eidin Family Trust	287.3	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	<p>Considers that the rezoning of Selwyn Terrace would be a dramatic change and would enable activities that conflict with the current primary use of Selwyn Terrace as a distinct enclave of residential dwellings.</p> <p>Considers that the Council is incorrect to say that Selwyn Terrace already has a mixture of land uses.</p> <p>Does not agree that a land use change is necessary to support a mixture of activities and growth, considering the street is very narrow and steep access, with a single carriageway for much of its length. A change to a commercial zoning would place unreasonable demand on vehicle and pedestrian access.</p> <p>Considers that Selwyn Terrace has a high concentration of pre-1930s character as evidenced by the 2019 Pre-1930s character area review report.</p> <p>Considers that 9 Selwyn Terrace is an excellent example of the work of one of Wellington's pre-eminent architects of the 20th Century, William Gray Young.</p> <p>Selwyn Terrace has special historic context as a reminder of the original suburb prior to the construction of the Wellington Motorway.</p> <p>Considers the plan provides sufficient development capacity without needing to change planning settings in Selwyn Terrace.</p> <p>[Refer to original submission for full reason]</p>	Seeks that Selwyn Terrace, Thorndon is rezoned from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.290	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.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.176	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective. [Interred reference to submission 158.1]	Allow	Reject.	No.
Wellington Branch NZIA	301.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that Adelaide Road should not be classified as CCZ. The street is likely unsuitable for the creation of further high-rise areas due to it being the former boggy route of a wetland stream. Medium-rise development to the level of 5-6 storeys and the occasional nine storey tower should be continued.	Rezone Adelaide Road from City Centre Zone to High Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject – Adelaide Road to be rezoned as Mixed Use Zone	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.212	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.
Roland Sapsford	305.22	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Considers that Palmer Street should not be surrounded on four sides by buildings with permitted heights of 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 all City Centre Zones adjoining Palmer Street be rezoned to Medium Density Residential Zone. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.265	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.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
LIVE WELLington	FS96.110	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	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 of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.155	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Roland Sapsford	305.23	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	Supports zone change from CCZ to MRZ at the sites on the west side of Willis Street between Aro Street and Abel Smith Street. Considers these sites are only included in the City Centre zone due to an historical mapping error repeatedly acknowledged but unaddressed by WCC. In essence this area was 10 covered by the 1960s designation for the Te Aro motorway, but when that designation was removed the boundary was not adjusted. Ten storeys over 100% of the site is not appropriate for this location. These sites would still be zoned up to six storeys once rezoned.	Rezoning the sites on the west side of Willis Street between Aro Street and Abel Smith Street from City Centre Zone to Medium Density Residential.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.266	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.
LIVE WELLington	FS96.111	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	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 of this table. These proposals protect historic heritage from inappropriate development as required by section 6(f) of the RMA.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.156	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Reject.	No.
U.S. Embassy Wellington	366.1	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	As identified on a provided map [see original submission], seeks an amendment to the mapping to exclude all properties highlighted in red on the supplied map from the proposed 27m height limit and subject to a 10m height limit. This is for security reasons.	Amend the CCZ (City Centre Zone) Maps so that all properties highlighted in red on the supplied map [see original submission] are exempt from the 27m height limit and subject to a 10m height limit.	Reject.	No.
Thorndon Residents' Association Inc	FS69.29	General / Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Support	The U.S. Embassy Wellington's desire for neighbouring properties to be restricted to a maximum height of 10m aligns with the TRA's submission to add a character precinct for the Hobson area and to rezone the entire Hobson precinct as MDRZ. TRA respectfully highlight that this concern (or similar) would be matched by other 'special' properties situated in the vicinity. The Hobson precinct of Thorndon is valued for its special character, and height and other controls have very effectively maintained these special character values, and charm to this part of the city. TRA submit that the TRA's submission (#333) to change the PDP to medium density residential zoning in the Hobson precinct, and introducing a character precinct for the Hobson area, would help address the concerns of this submitter. [Refer to Further Submission for full reasons including extract from U.S. Embassy submission].	Allow	Reject.	No.
U.S. Embassy Wellington	366.2	Mapping / Rezone / Rezone	Amend	As identified on a provided map [see original submission], seeks an amendment to the mapping to exclude all properties highlighted in red on the supplied map from the proposed 22m minimum height and subject to a 10m height limit. This is for security reasons.	Amend the CCZ (City Centre Zone) Maps so that all properties highlighted in red on the supplied map [see original submission] are exempt from the proposed 22m minimum height and are subject to a 10m height limit	Reject.	No.
Z Energy Limited	361.1	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	The CCZ at Z Taranaki Street Service Station and Z Vivian Street Service Station is supported.	Retain City Centre Zone at 155 Taranaki Street (Z Taranaki Street) and 174 Vivian Street (Z Vivian Street).	Accept.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.4	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the application of City Centre zoning to 22 The Terrace, 1 Grey Street, 20 Customhouse Quay and 215 Lambton Quay.	Retain the zoning of 22 The Terrace as notified.	Accept.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.5	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the application of City Centre zoning to 22 The Terrace, 1 Grey Street, 20 Customhouse Quay and 215 Lambton Quay.	Retain zoning of 1 Grey Street as notified.	Accept.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.6	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the application of City Centre zoning to 22 The Terrace, 1 Grey Street, 20 Customhouse Quay and 215 Lambton Quay.	Retain zoning of 20 Customhouse Quay as notified.	Accept.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.7	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports the application of City Centre zoning to 22 The Terrace, 1 Grey Street, 20 Customhouse Quay and 215 Lambton Quay.	Retain zoning of 215 Lambton Quay as notified.	Accept.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Oyster Management Limited	404.2	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Amend	Considers that the 90m Height Control Overlay should extend over 141 The Terrace, 294 and 298 Lambton Quay so it is contiguous with the height control applying to 312 Lambton Quay and other sites to the south.	Amend 90m Height Control Overlay to extend over 141 The Terrace, 294 and 298 Lambton Quay. [Refer to original submission for maps of the submitter's properties under the Proposed District Plan].	Reject.	No.
Oyster Management Limited	404.3	Mapping / AllOverlays / Overlays General	Support	Supports the 75m Height Control Area applying to Lambton Quay.	Retain 75m Height Control Area extent as notified. [Refer to original submission for maps of the submitter's properties under the Proposed District Plan].	Reject.	No.
McDonald's	274.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support in part	In general, the submitter (McDonald's) supports the zonings that have been applied to their existing restaurants.	Not specified.	Accept.	No.
Mt Victoria Residents' Association	342.18	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that Kent Terrace and Cambridge Terrace partially perform the function of a town centre for Mount Victoria. All of Mt Victoria should be treated as one unit for planning purposes, so transition issues along the boundary between the CBD and Mt Victoria can be addressed. Including Cambridge and Kent Terraces within Mt Victoria will also provide a much-needed buffer/ transition area from the city centre high rises – not just in heights, but in the character-scape – and will support community connection.	Seeks that all of Mount Victoria is treated as one unit that includes Cambridge Terrace and Kent Terrace.	Reject.	No.
Wellington's Character Charitable Trust	FS82.191	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.
Historic Places Wellington Inc	FS111.121	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Support	Considers that the notified mapping extent of the Character precincts is too small to adequately protect sites within heritage suburbs from inappropriate subdivision or development under s.6 of the RMA. Considers that the character (or "heritage") precincts must be enlarged, or otherwise protected, to achieve that objective.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Michael O'Rourke	194.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / General HRZ	Amend	Opposes the strip south of the Basin Reserve up Adelaide Road to John Street being zoned as CCZ. Notes that by various measures, including the Wellington Regional Council City Zone for public transport ending at the Basin, this area is not the CBD. [Refer to original submission for full detail].	Amend the mapping to rezone the Adelaide Road spine as High Density Residential Zone.	Reject – Adelaide Road to be rezoned as Mixed Use Zone	No.
Property Council New Zealand	338.12	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Amend	Considers that incentives for large developments that can demonstrate a City Outcomes Contribution (such as priority consenting) would establish a quid pro quo system and enable growth rather than placing additional obstacles for large-scale development to occur.	Seeks that incentives be provided to encourage but not require large developments to deliver City Outcomes Contributions.	Accept – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.204	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.204	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.9	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Support	Supports policy HRZ-P13 and widest possible application of the City Outcomes Contribution through the Environmental and Accessibility Performance Fund established by the WCC in order to incentivise the building of housing and public buildings to Universal Design standards. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]	Retain HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Disabled Persons Assembly New Zealand Incorporated	343.1	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Support	Supports policy HRZ-P13 and widest possible application of the City Outcomes Contribution through the Environmental and Accessibility Performance Fund established by the WCC in order to incentivise the building of housing and public buildings to Universal Design standards. [Submitter has referenced Centres and Mixed Use Design Guide in their submission rather than the Residential Design Guide.]	Retain HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	350.178	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Oppose	Opposes the inclusion of the City Outcomes Contribution requirements of HRZ-P13 and considers that any requirements associated with developments that are under or over height should directly relate to mitigation of potential or actual effects. Considers that the policy would create barriers that strongly conflict with the need to resolve the housing crisis and address the needs of the rapidly growing aging population.	Delete HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) in its entirety as notified.	Accept – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Waka Kotahi	370.348	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Support in part	Supports in part.	Retain HRZ-P13 (City outcomes contribution) with amendments.	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Waka Kotahi	370.349	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Amend	Considers that commercial activities should be encouraged and supported where appropriate and integrated with residential development.	Amend HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) as follows: 5. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility.; and/or 6. <u>Incorporating non-residential uses to provide for mixed use development.</u>	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
BP Oil New Zealand, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies)	372.145	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) as notified.	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.457	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Oppose	Policy HRZ-P13 is opposed and amendment is sought.	Opposes Policy HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) and amendment is sought.	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.140	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to remove the design guides in full.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.140	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to remove the design guides in full.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Kāinga Ora Homes and Communities	391.458	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Amend	Considers that amendments are required to Policy HRZ-P13 to instead encourage positive outcomes for development in the HRZ. [See original submission for further details]	Amend Policy HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contributions) as follows: Require over height, large scale residential <u>Encourage</u> development in the High Density Residential Zone to contribute to positive outcomes deliver City Outcomes Contributions as detailed and scored in the Residential Design Guide, including through either: 1. Positively contributing to public space provision and the amenity of the site and surrounding area; and/or 2. Incorporating a level of building performance that leads to reduced carbon emissions and increased climate change resilience; and/or 3. Incorporating construction materials that increase the lifespan and resilience of the development and reduce ongoing maintenance costs; and/or 4. Incorporating assisted housing into the development, and where this is provided legal instruments are required to ensure that it remains assisted housing for at least 25 years; and/or 5. Enabling ease of access for people of all ages and mobility.	Reject – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.141	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Oppose	The RVA oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with The RVA's primary submission to remove the design guides in full.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Ryman Healthcare Limited	FS128.141	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Oppose	Ryman oppose the relief sought in this submission as it is inconsistent with Ryman's primary submission to remove the design guides in full.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Investore Property Limited	405.55	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Oppose	Considers that the 'City Outcomes Contributions' provisions are inappropriate. Specifically is opposed to requiring 'City Outcomes Contributions' for 'over height' development which he submitter considers is inappropriate. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. [Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachment]	Seeks that HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) is deleted in its entirety as notified.	Accept – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
VictLabour	414.33	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Support in part	Supportive of the inclusion of a points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits (the city outcomes contribution mechanism) but considers it an example of how arbitrary and excessive many of these regulations are, particularly around height and character protections.	Seeks to retain points based system to allow developments outside of some of the rules in the PDP if they provide other benefits. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept in part.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendations	Changes to PDP?
Willis Bond and Company Limited	416.83	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Amend	<p>The submitter considers that while they are generally supportive of the City Outcomes Contribution, there needs to be a level of certainty that the significant investment required to deliver these outcomes will result in material and reliable intensifications (be it height, floor area ratio, etc).</p> <p>As currently drafted, the initiative remains “subject to” numerous other mechanisms in the plan, potentially rendering it ineffective, despite its good intentions. HRZ-P13 is also phrased to “require” City Outcomes Contributions, rather than to provide a clear incentive for meeting the requested outcomes.</p> <p>The City Outcomes Contribution should be reviewed to reflect any amendments made to CCZ-P11 and the relevant provisions in the Design Guides.</p>	Seeks that HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) be reconsidered following any amendments to the City Outcomes Contribution within the City Centre Zone.	Accept – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
The Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	FS126.256	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	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	FS128.256	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	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.
Fabric Property Limited	425.49	Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Oppose	<p>Opposed to the ‘City Outcomes Contributions’ provisions, and specifically is opposed to requiring ‘City Outcomes Contributions’ for ‘over height’ development. While Fabric recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules.</p> <p>Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.</p> <p>The ‘City Outcomes Contributions’ have the potential to act as a disincentive for development, which conflicts with the Proposed Plan strategic objectives and NPS-UD requirements of providing development capacity and providing for urban intensification. This would not achieve the aim of “density done well” as stated in the Design Guide.</p> <p>Seeks that all references to the City Outcomes Contributions be removed from the Proposed Plan and design guides.</p>	Delete HRZ-P13 (City Outcomes Contribution) in it’s entirety.	Accept – City Outcomes Contribution to be replaced with City Development Outcomes	Yes.
McDonald’s Restaurants New Zealand Limited	FS45.9	Part 3 / Residential Zones / High Density Residential Zone / HRZP13	Support	McDonald’s Restaurants New Zealand Limited supports these submissions seeking deletion of the City Outcomes Contributions. While MRNZL recognises the intent of these provisions in providing publicly beneficial outcomes, it is inappropriate for the provision of these publicly beneficial outcomes to be connected to non-compliance with height rules. Developments that breach height standards should instead be considered on their own merits and effects. The provision of beneficial outcomes in any development should be considered as part of the merits of a development, and should not be confined to a specified and required list.	Allow	Accept	No.

Waterfront Zone

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.74	Special Purpose Zones Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Support	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.	Retain the provisions applicable to “residential activities” in the Waterfront Zone as notified.	Accept.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.53	Special Purpose Zones Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Support in part	The Waterfront Zone at the former Lambton Harbour Area is supported in concept, but some specific issues temper support.	Retain the Waterfront Zone chapter, with amendment.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.54	Special Purpose Zones Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Amend	Considers that the introduction of the Waterfront Area chapter should be amended to clearly state the principles of collective ownership and engagement from the Wellington Waterfront Framework 2001. The Wellington Waterfront Framework 2001 was intended to be Stage One of a three-stage process. Stage two was to prepare detailed plans for each of the sub-areas, and Stage three was an implementation and monitoring stage. The current Framework is thus no more than a framework, as has been pointed out by the Environment Court. While it is important, it lacks clarity and detail. In the absence of Stages two and three, the principles of collective ownership and engagement from the Framework need to be incorporated more clearly in the Zone introduction.	Amend the Introduction of the Waterfront Zone chapter to state the following principles from the Wellington Waterfront Framework 2001 after paragraph #4: ... - <u>The waterfront is predominantly a public area.</u> - <u>The public should be consulted – either through the stage two process or through a statutory planning process – about any proposed new buildings and any significant changes to existing buildings.</u> - <u>Ground floors of buildings will be predominantly accessible to the public.</u>	Reject.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	F559.1	Special Purpose Zones Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Support	The Fale Malae Trust strongly supports specific recognition in the Introduction to the WFZ of the waterfront being predominantly a public area, and inclusion of a strong direction that public consultation is expected for significant developments. The Trust notes that paragraph seven of the Introduction already supports these matters, but is open to alternative wording or the direct incorporation of principles from the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust also strongly supports the recognition of mana whenua connections to the waterfront area in the Introduction.	Amend / Allow submission point 388.54 with alternative wording if this is considered necessary.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.55	Special Purpose Zones Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Amend	Considers that the introduction of the Waterfront Area chapter should be amended to clarify the circumstances in which public notification will occur. Paragraph 7 of the Introduction says that all “significant” new development are publicly notified, but it is noted that there is no indication of what might be considered “significant”. There is concern over the cumulative effects of numerous small building additions with permitted activity status in the current plan provisions, which could significantly change the nature of this important public area. Clarification should state whether public notification is intended for any new building, structure or activity which requires a resource consent in or outside the Waterfront Public Open Space.	Amend the Introduction of the Waterfront Zone chapter to clarify the circumstances in which public notification will occur.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.56	Special Purpose Zones Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Oppose in part	Considers that provisional zoning in the Waterfront Zone chapter is not adequate. Some areas in the Waterfront Zone do not appear to be specifically excluded from further encroachment by buildings and private residential use and could lose their connectivity function.	The Waterfront Zone chapter is partially opposed and an amendment is sought.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.57	Special Purpose Zones Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Amend	Considers that some areas in the Waterfront Zone do not appear to be specifically excluded from further encroachment by buildings and private residential use and could lose their connectivity function. The mapping of the Waterfront Zone shows three types of areas – Public open spaces, Queens Wharf buildings and Areas of change. A large part of the Zone area is outside all of these three. Such areas are either the footprints of existing buildings, or are often multi-purpose access and connection areas, public “shared areas” where slow-moving vehicles, pedestrians and those using micro-mobility devices (including bikes) co-exist. These are also part of the public open space network. The purpose of these areas should be made very clear in the description of the Zone.	Amend the Introduction of the Waterfront Zone chapter to clarify the purpose of the areas which are not within the three identified areas, including where areas are not building footprints or open space access and connection areas.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.58	Special Purpose Zones Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Amend	Considers that some areas in the Waterfront Zone do not appear to be specifically excluded from further encroachment by buildings and private residential use and could lose their connectivity function. The mapping of the Waterfront Zone shows three types of areas – Public open spaces, Queens Wharf buildings and Areas of change. A large part of the Zone area is outside all of these three. Such areas are either the footprints of existing buildings, or are often multi-purpose access and connection areas, public “shared areas” where slow-moving vehicles, pedestrians and those using micro-mobility devices (including bikes) co-exist. These are also part of the public open space network. The purpose of these areas should be made very clear in the description of the Zone.	Seeks to ensure that the rules do not allow for cumulative effects by filling up these publicly accessible spaces.	Accept in part.	Yes.
CentrePort Limited	402.210	Special Purpose Zones Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Support	Supports Waterfront zoning. CentrePort owns the triangle of land between Lady Elizabeth Lane and Waterloo and Interislander wharves. Previously this land was included as being part of the Coastal Marine Area. It is an integral part of the future development of both of these wharves which are specifically recognised through Policy 51 (Heritage demolition) and Policy 149 (Lambton Harbour Area) of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan. While CentrePort supports this Zoning, this is on the basis that any redevelopment proposal for this area will be assessed for its compatibility with urban form and other matters, rather than an acceptance that the zero height	Retain Waterfront zoning at the triangle of land between Lady Elizabeth Lane and Waterloo and Interislander wharves [Refer to original submission for map extent].		

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
				limit indicates that no built structures can or should occur. [Refer to original submission for map extent]		Accept.	No.
Fabric Limited	Property 425.86	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Support in part	Supports the objectives and policies for the Waterfront Zone generally, and specifically supports the development of buildings to maintain or enhance the sense of place and distinctive form, quality and amenity of the Waterfront Zone (WFZ-P5).	Retain objectives in Special Purpose Waterfront Zone as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.2	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Support	The Fale Malae Trust generally supports the proposed objectives and policies for the WFZ (subject to the further submission points below), including the specific recognition of buildings that maintain or enhance the sense of place and distinctive form, quality and amenity of the Waterfront Zone, are appropriate. (In particular WFZ-P5).	Allow / Allow submission points 425.86.	Accept in part.	No.
Fabric Limited	Property 425.87	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Support in part	Supports the objectives and policies for the Waterfront Zone generally, and specifically supports the development of buildings to maintain or enhance the sense of place and distinctive form, quality and amenity of the Waterfront Zone (WFZ-P5).	Retain policies in Special Purpose Waterfront Zone as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.3	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / General WFZ	Support	The Fale Malae Trust generally supports the proposed objectives and policies for the WFZ (subject to the further submission points below), including the specific recognition of buildings that maintain or enhance the sense of place and distinctive form, quality and amenity of the Waterfront Zone, are appropriate. (In particular WFZ-P5).	Allow / Allow submission point 425.87	Accept in part.	No.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.75	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / New WFZ	Amend	<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 land use activity rules applying to supported and transitional accommodation activities in the Mixed Use, City Centre and Waterfront zones are amended. The zone frameworks would not otherwise enable supported residential care activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zones, in accordance with the respective default "all other activities" rules (MUZ-R13, CCZ-R16 and WFZ-R11).</p> <p>Supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama, 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. The subject zones include suitable locations for supported and transitional accommodation activities; as they are close to civic amenities and services. This is apparent in that the zones provide for residential activities as permitted, including aligned activities such as visitor accommodation. Supported and transitional accommodation activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in the Mixed Use, City Centre and Waterfront zones. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones, and the effects of such can be managed through the imposition of a restriction on the maximum number of residents (10), as is the case in the residential zones.</p>	<p>Amend the land use activity rule framework for the Waterfront Zone to include a new permitted activity rule applying to "supported residential care activities" as follows, if the definition of "supported residential care activity" is retained:</p> <p><u>WFZ-RX Supported residential care activities</u></p> <p><u>1. Activity Status: Permitted</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. The maximum occupancy does not exceed 10 residents; and</u> <u>b. The activity is located above ground floor level.</u></p> <p><u>Cross-reference – also refer to NOISE-R5 and NOISE-S4 for noise-sensitive controls near the Port Zone.</u></p> <p><u>2. Activity status: Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>a. Compliance with the requirements of WFZ-RX.1.a cannot be achieved.</u></p>	Accept.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.59	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ01	Support in part	WFZ-O1 is partially supported and clarification is sought.	Retain Objective WFZ-O1 (Purpose) with amendment.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.60	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ01	Amend	Considers that WFZ-O1 should be amended to clarify part of this objective. It is considered that part of the objective is vague and does not help provide a vision for the zone, particularly the part that states "the unique and special components and elements".	<p>Amend Objective WFZ-O1 (Purpose) as follows:</p> <p>Activities and development in the Waterfront Zone contribute to Wellington's identity and sense of place, with public spaces, buildings and other structures that reflect the unique location and existing character of and special components and elements that make up the waterfront.</p>	Accept in part.	Yes.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.127	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ02	Amend	Considers that only Taranaki Whānui can be referred in relation to Ahi Kā.	Seeks that WFZ-O2 (Ahi Kā) is amended to include "Taranaki Whānui hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status in Wellington City."	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.66	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-02	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Taranaki Whānui ki te Upoko o te Ika	389.128	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ02	Amend	Considers that only Taranaki Whānui can be referred in relation to Ahi Kā.	Seeks that WFZ-02 (Ahi Kā) is amend to remove any other references to iwi. [Inferred decision requested]	Reject.	No.
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	FS138.67	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-02	Oppose	The submitter seeks amendments throughout the plan seeking Taranaki Whānui to hold ahi kā and primary mana whenua status throughout Te Whanganui a Tara rohe. Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira understand and acknowledge that Taranaki Whānui have a physical presence within Te Whanganui a Tara. However, if this was implemented in the plan this would mean that their ahi kā would extend across the entire extent of the Wellington City Council boundary. Ngāti Toa Rangatira do have a physical presence in Te Whanganui a Tara and sites of significance which are listed in the plan. This means that Ngāti Toa Rangatira still need to be engaged with in terms of resource management and resource consents.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
VicLabour	414.47	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ02	Support	Supportive of ahi ka provisions	Retain WFZ-02 (Ahi kā) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.4	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ02	Support	The Fale Malae Trust supports WFZ-02 in acknowledging the cultural associations and development interests of mana whenua in the Waterfront Zone.	Allow / Allow submission point 414.47	Accept.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.61	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ03	Support in part	WFZ-03 is partially supported and clarification is sought.	Retain Objective WFZ-03 (Protection of public open spaces) with amendment.	Accept in part.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.5	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ03	Support	The need for a clarifying amendment to WFZ-03 is supported. The current direction to protect and maintain the mapped public open space for temporary and recreation activities could be interpreted to not support new buildings or structures that would enhance and benefit the waterfront. New highquality buildings may be appropriate in the waterfront's public open spaces, particularly when replacing existing buildings of lesser quality. WFZ-03 should be amended accordingly. The proposed strong direction in WFZ-03 would restrict appropriate development and does not align with other Waterfront Zone provisions, including: - WFZ-01 which recognises the waterfront is made up of a combination of elements. - WFZ-P7 which recognises that some types of new buildings are appropriate in public open space and can improve public use and enjoyment. - WFZ-R15 which recognises that different types of new buildings in public open space can be assessed as different activity statuses. The submission that WFZ-03 should allow temporary and recreation activities 'only' is not supported as this may discourage or prevent types of beneficial developments for public open space areas being advanced for consideration and public consultation.	Amend / Seeks that WFZ-03 is amended to ensure scope is provided for new or replacement buildings and structures that may be appropriate in the public open spaces of the waterfront.	Accept in part.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.62	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ03	Amend	Considers that WFZ-03 should be amended as it is poorly worded and hard to understand.	Amend Objective WFZ-03 (Protection of public open spaces) as follows: The Waterfront's public open spaces identified on the planning maps mapped as specific controls are protected and maintained for temporary activities and recreational activity only.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fale Malae Trust	F559.6	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ03	Support	<p>The need for a clarifying amendment to WFZ-03 is supported. The current direction to protect and maintain the mapped public open space for temporary and recreation activities could be interpreted to not support new buildings or structures that would enhance and benefit the waterfront. New highquality buildings may be appropriate in the waterfront's public open spaces, particularly when replacing existing buildings of lesser quality. WFZ-03 should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>The proposed strong direction in WFZ-03 would restrict appropriate development and does not align with other Waterfront Zone provisions, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WFZ-O1 which recognises the waterfront is made up of a combination of elements. - WFZ-P7 which recognises that some types of new buildings are appropriate in public open space and can improve public use and enjoyment. - WFZ-R15 which recognises that different types of new buildings in public open space can be assessed as different activity statuses. <p>The submission that WFZ-03 should allow temporary and recreation activities 'only' is not supported as this may discourage or prevent types of beneficial developments for public open space areas being advanced for consideration and public consultation.</p>	Amend / Seeks that WFZ-03 is amended to ensure scope is provided for new or replacement buildings and structures that may be appropriate in the public open spaces of the waterfront.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.63	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ05	Support in part	WFZ-05 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective WFZ-05 (Connections to Te Whanganui a Tara, public transport and the City Centre) with amendment.	Accept.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.64	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ05	Amend	Considers that WFZ-05 should be amended to emphasise connectivity throughout the Waterfront Zone. There is concern that connectivity is not provided for or protected by a description or policy provision and yet it is vital to the future of the waterfront. It is sought that that the heading and text of this Objective includes this connectivity throughout the zone and not just from the harbour, to the City Centra and to public transport.	<p>Amend Objective WFZ-05 (Connections to Te Whanganui a Tara, public transport and the City Centre) as follows:</p> <p>Connections to Te Whanganui a Tara, public transport and the City Centre <u>and throughout the Zone</u>.</p> <p>Active transport and micro-mobility connections between the edge of Te Whanganui a Tara, public transport and the City Centre are maintained or enhanced <u>and connectivity is provided throughout the Zone</u>.</p>	Accept in part.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.65	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ07	Support in part	WFZ-07 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain Objective WFZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) with amendment.	Accept.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.66	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ07	Amend	Considers that connectivity within the Zone's open spaces (whether labelled as public open space or not) should be considered when assessing any developments or activities. Connectivity has been a fundamental part of the development of the waterfront area. It is also noted that some of the items listed in 2. do not seem to interface with the Waterfront Zone.	<p>Amend Objective WFZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) as follows:</p> <p>Adverse effects of activities and development in the Waterfront Zone are managed effectively both:</p> <p>1. Within the zone, including on its role, and function <u>and connectivity</u>; and</p> <p>...</p>	Accept.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.67	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ07	Amend	Considers that WFZ-02 may mention interfaces that do not exist, namely: c. Mapped public open spaces; d. Identified pedestrian streets; e. Residential zoned areas; f. Open space zoned areas; Correction as appropriate is sought.	Amend Objective WFZ-07 (Managing adverse effects) to ensure the validity of items c, d, e and f in WFZ-07.2.	Accept.	Yes.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.76	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP1	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 WFZ-P1.8 (Enabled activities) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.77	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP1	Amend	<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 land use activity rules applying to supported and transitional accommodation activities in the Mixed Use, City Centre and Waterfront zones are amended. The zone frameworks would not otherwise enable supported residential care activities, and provides discretionary activity status for these activities in the zones, in accordance with the respective default "all other activities" rules (MUZ-R13, CCZ-R16 and WFZ-R11).</p> <p>Supported and transitional accommodation activities, such as those provided for by Ara Poutama, 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. The subject zones include suitable locations for supported and transitional accommodation activities; as they are close to civic amenities and services. This is apparent in that the zones provide for residential activities as permitted, including aligned activities such as visitor accommodation. Supported and transitional accommodation activities are a compatible and appropriate activity in the Mixed Use, City Centre and Waterfront zones. They are consistent with the character and amenity of such zones, and the effects of such can be managed through the imposition of a restriction on the maximum number of residents (10), as is the case in the residential zones.</p>	<p>Amend WFZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows, if the definition of "supported residential care activity" is retained:</p> <p>WFZ-P1 Enabled activities</p> <p>Enable a range and diversity of activities that support the role and function of the Waterfront Zone and enhance the Zone's vitality, vibrancy and amenity during the day and night, including:</p> <p>8. Residential activities <u>and supported residential care activities</u> above ground floor.</p>	Accept.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.337	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP1	Support	Supports the policy as it permits the delivery of new emergency service facilities within the zone. Due to urban growth, population changes and commitments to response times, FENZ may need to locate new stations in the WFZ.	Retain WFZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.68	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP1	Support in part	WFZ-P1 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-P1 (Enabled activities) with amendment.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.7	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP1	Support	<p>The need for amendments to these policies is supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Demolition of buildings that results in creation of unutilised vacant land' is both an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3, and a managed activity in WFZ-P2. It is considered that the reference in WFZ-P2 should simply be to 'demolition of buildings'. - Consistent with this, WFZ-P1 should include as enabled activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 'demolition of buildings to enable development of new buildings or activities that enhance the waterfront'. This would be consistent with WFZ-R13 where demolition or removal of a building for the purpose of constructing a new consented building is a permitted activity. o The replacement and upgrade of existing buildings and structures with new buildings and structures. - 'Significant buildings in mapped public open space' should be classed as a managed activity in WFZP2, not an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3. As stated above, strong direction restricting buildings in public open space areas is not consistent with WFZ-O1, WFZ-P7 and WFZ-R15, and may discourage or prevent beneficial developments for public open space areas being advanced for public consultation and consideration. - The content of WFZ-P1, WFZ-P2 and WFZ-P3 is otherwise supported. 	<p>Seeks that WFZ-P1 (Enabled activities) is amended as follow:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Enable a range... including:</p> <p>...</p> <p>7. Visitor accommodation; and</p> <p>8. Residential activities above ground floor; <u>and</u></p> <p>9. <u>demolition of buildings as part of the development of new buildings or activities that enhance the waterfront.</u></p>	Accept in part.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.69	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP1	Amend	<p>Considers that WFZ-P1 should be amended to remove public transport activities and to enable visitor accommodation only above ground floor. Connections to public transport, including ticketing facilities and stops adjacent to on-street public transport are supported. In the past, this area has been proposed to have a connected light rail or similar system passing through it. That remains a future possibility, but it is not one that should be a permitted activity, as included under this policy.</p> <p>Most activities listed in the definition of "Public Transport Activities" are unsuited for the location of Wellington's waterfront, due to its scarce resources. These activities should be listed under WFZ-P2.</p> <p>Ground floor use of the Waterfront Zoned area for visitor accommodation is opposed. This activity should be treated on the same basis as residential, and permitted at above ground floor only.</p>	<p>Amend WFZ-P1 (Enabled activities) as follows:</p> <p>Enable a range and diversity of activities that support the role and function of the Waterfront Zone and enhance the Zone's vitality, vibrancy and amenity during the day and night, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commercial activities; 2. Community facilities; 3. Recreation activities; 4. Emergency service facilities; 5. Marae activities; 6. Public transport activities; 7. <u>Visitor accommodation above ground floor;</u> and 8. <u>Residential activities above ground floor.</u> 	Accept in part.	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.8	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP1	Support	<p>The need for amendments to these policies is supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Demolition of buildings that results in creation of unutilised vacant land' is both an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3, and a managed activity in WFZ-P2. It is considered that the reference in WFZ-P2 should simply be to 'demolition of buildings'. - Consistent with this, WFZ-P1 should include as enabled activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 'demolition of buildings to enable development of new buildings or activities that enhance the waterfront'. This would be consistent with WFZ-R13 where demolition or removal of a building for the purpose of constructing a new consented building is a permitted activity. o The replacement and upgrade of existing buildings and structures with new buildings and structures. - 'Significant buildings in mapped public open space' should be classed as a managed activity in WFZP2, not an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3. As stated above, strong direction restricting buildings in public open space areas is not consistent with WFZ-O1, WFZ-P7 and WFZ-R15, and may discourage or prevent beneficial developments for public open space areas being advanced for public consultation and consideration. - The content of WFZ-P1, WFZ-P2 and WFZ-P3 is otherwise supported. 	<p>Seeks that WFZ-P1 (Enabled activities) is amended as follow:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Enable a range... including:</p> <p>...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Visitor accommodation; and 8. Residential activities above ground floor; and 9. <u>demolition of buildings as part of the development of new buildings or activities that enhance the waterfront.</u> 	Accept in part.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.70	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP2	Support in part	WFZ-P2 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-P2 (Managed activities) with amendment.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.9	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP2	Support	<p>The need for amendments to these policies is supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Demolition of buildings that results in creation of unutilised vacant land' is both an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3, and a managed activity in WFZ-P2. It is considered that the reference in WFZ-P2 should simply be to 'demolition of buildings'. - Consistent with this, WFZ-P1 should include as enabled activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 'demolition of buildings to enable development of new buildings or activities that enhance the waterfront'. This would be consistent with WFZ-R13 where demolition or removal of a building for the purpose of constructing a new consented building is a permitted activity. o The replacement and upgrade of existing buildings and structures with new buildings and structures. - 'Significant buildings in mapped public open space' should be classed as a managed activity in WFZP2, not an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3. As stated above, strong direction restricting buildings in public open space areas is not consistent with WFZ-O1, WFZ-P7 and WFZ-R15, and may discourage or prevent beneficial developments for public open space areas being advanced for public consultation and consideration. - The content of WFZ-P1, WFZ-P2 and WFZ-P3 is otherwise supported. 	<p>Seeks that WFZ-P2 (Managed Activities) is amended as follows:</p> <p>Managed activities</p> <p>Manage the location and scale of activities which could result in cumulative adverse effects on the vitality, vibrancy and amenity of the Waterfront Zone, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Industrial activities; 2. Construction of apartments and visitor accommodation; 3. New and expanded buildings; 4. New and modified public space; and 5. Demolition of buildings that results in the creation of unutilised vacant land; 6. <u>Significant buildings in mapped public open space; and</u> 7. <u>The replacement and upgrade of existing buildings and structures with new buildings and structures.</u> 	Accept in part.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.71	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP2	Amend	<p>Considers that WFZ-P2 should be amended to include public transport activities as managed activities in the Waterfront Zone. Most activities listed in the definition of "Public Transport Activities" are unsuited for the location of Wellington's waterfront, due to its scarce resources. These activities include:</p> <p>"a. train stations; b. bus stations/exchanges; c. rapid transit stops; d. ferry terminals; and e. ancillary ticketing and passenger facilities, charging/fuelling stations, storage and maintenance depots, offices and retail." These activities should be listed under managed activities.</p>	<p>Amend WFZ-P2 (Managed activities) as follows:</p> <p>Manage the location and scale of activities which could result in cumulative adverse effects on the vitality, vibrancy and amenity of the Waterfront Zone, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Industrial activities; 2. Construction of apartments and visitor accommodation; 3. New and expanded buildings; 4. New and modified public space; and 5. Demolition of buildings that results in the creation of unutilised vacant land; and 6. <u>Public transport activities.</u> 	Accept in part.	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.10	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP2	Support	<p>The need for amendments to these policies is supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Demolition of buildings that results in creation of unutilised vacant land' is both an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3, and a managed activity in WFZ-P2. It is considered that the reference in WFZ-P2 should simply be to 'demolition of buildings'. - Consistent with this, WFZ-P1 should include as enabled activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 'demolition of buildings to enable development of new buildings or activities that enhance the waterfront'. This would be consistent with WFZ-R13 where demolition or removal of a building for the purpose of constructing a new consented building is a permitted activity. o The replacement and upgrade of existing buildings and structures with new buildings and structures. - 'Significant buildings in mapped public open space' should be classed as a managed activity in WFZP2, not an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3. As stated above, strong direction restricting buildings in public open space areas is not consistent with WFZ-O1, WFZ-P7 and WFZ-R15, and may discourage or prevent beneficial developments for public open space areas being advanced for public consultation and consideration. - The content of WFZ-P1, WFZ-P2 and WFZ-P3 is otherwise supported. 	<p>Seeks that WFZ-P2 (Managed Activities) is amended as follows:</p> <p>Managed activities</p> <p>Manage the location and scale of activities which could result in cumulative adverse effects on the vitality, vibrancy and amenity of the Waterfront Zone, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Industrial activities; 2. Construction of apartments and visitor accommodation; 3. New and expanded buildings; 4. New and modified public space; and 5. Demolition of buildings that results in the creation of unutilised vacant land; 6. <u>Significant buildings in mapped public open space; and</u> 7. <u>The replacement and upgrade of existing buildings and structures with new buildings and structures.</u> 	Accept in part.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.72	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP3	Support in part	WFZ-P3 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-P3 (Incompatible activities) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.11	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP3	Support	<p>The need for amendments to these policies is supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Demolition of buildings that results in creation of unutilised vacant land' is both an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3, and a managed activity in WFZ-P2. It is considered that the reference in WFZ-P2 should simply be to 'demolition of buildings'. - Consistent with this, WFZ-P1 should include as enabled activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 'demolition of buildings to enable development of new buildings or activities that enhance the waterfront'. This would be consistent with WFZ-R13 where demolition or removal of a building for the purpose of constructing a new consented building is a permitted activity. o The replacement and upgrade of existing buildings and structures with new buildings and structures. - 'Significant buildings in mapped public open space' should be classed as a managed activity in WFZP2, not an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3. As stated above, strong direction restricting buildings in public open space areas is not consistent with WFZ-O1, WFZ-P7 and WFZ-R15, and may discourage or prevent beneficial developments for public open space areas being advanced for public consultation and consideration. - The content of WFZ-P1, WFZ-P2 and WFZ-P3 is otherwise supported. 	<p>Seeks that WFZ-P3 (Incompatible activities) is amended as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>These incompatible activities include:</p> <p>...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Ground floor residential activities; and 4. <u>Significant buildings in mapped public open space; and</u> 5. Surface-level carparks, other than car parks for people with mobility issues, for service vehicles, and pick-up/drop-off parking 	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.73	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP3	Amend	Considers EFZ-P3 should be amended to include visitor accommodation. This activity should be treated on the same basis as residential activities, and should not be permitted at ground floor.	<p>Amend WFZ-P3 (Incompatible activities) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>These incompatible activities include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Heavy industrial activities; 2. Demolition of buildings that results in the creation of unutilised vacant land; 3. Ground floor residential <u>and visitor accommodation</u> activities; 4. Significant buildings in mapped public open space; and 5. Surface-level carparks, other than car parks for people with mobility issues, for service vehicles, and pick-up/drop-off parking 	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.12	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP3	Support	<p>The need for amendments to these policies is supported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Demolition of buildings that results in creation of unutilised vacant land' is both an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3, and a managed activity in WFZ-P2. It is considered that the reference in WFZ-P2 should simply be to 'demolition of buildings'. - Consistent with this, WFZ-P1 should include as enabled activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o 'demolition of buildings to enable development of new buildings or activities that enhance the waterfront'. This would be consistent with WFZ-R13 where demolition or removal of a building for the purpose of constructing a new consented building is a permitted activity. o The replacement and upgrade of existing buildings and structures with new buildings and structures. - 'Significant buildings in mapped public open space' should be classed as a managed activity in WFZP2, not an incompatible activity in WFZ-P3. As stated above, strong direction restricting buildings in public open space areas is not consistent with WFZ-O1, WFZ-P7 and WFZ-R15, and may discourage or prevent beneficial developments for public open space areas being advanced for public consultation and consideration. - The content of WFZ-P1, WFZ-P2 and WFZ-P3 is otherwise supported. 	<p>Amend / Seeks that WFZ-P3 (Incompatible activities) is amended as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>These incompatible activities include:</p> <p>...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Ground floor residential activities; and 4. Significant buildings in mapped public open space; and 5. Surface-level carparks, other than car parks for people with mobility issues, for service vehicles, and pick-up/drop-off parking 	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.74	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP4	Support in part	WFZ-P4 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-P4 (Access, connections and public space) with amendment.	Accept.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.75	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP4	Amend	Considers that WFZ-P4 should be amended recognise connectivity.	<p>Amend WFZ-P4 (Access, connections and public space) as follows:</p> <p>Require that the use, development, and operation of the Waterfront Zone:</p> <p>...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Provides well-designed, <u>connected</u> and safe public space and pedestrian, cycle and micro-mobility access; <p>...</p>	Accept.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.76	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP5	Support in part	WFZ-P5 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-P5 (Sense of place) with amendment.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.13	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP5	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports WFZ-P5 and the direction to provide a balance of buildings and open space.</p> <p>The Trust also supports the clarifying amendment sought by the Wellington Civic Trust. The wording proposed in the PDP of 'building site coverage' doesn't make it clear that 35% coverage is intended to apply across the Waterfront Zone as a whole, not to individual building 'sites'. This intention is more clearly expressed in WFZ-S6. The Trust suggests a reference to 'building footprint' would be an alternative way of providing clarity.</p>	Allow / Seeks that the submission point is allowed, with minor amendment, or wording to similar effect sought by 388.77.	Accept.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.77	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP5	Amend	Considers that WFZ-P5 should be amended to clarify the 35% building coverage requirement. The links to "building" and "site" definitions indicate that the measure would be based on individual site calculations. This becomes complex given that some areas are on long-term lease and therefore meet the RMA definition of subdivision. It is recommended that a clarification be provided on what is intended. There may be other ways to amend WPF-P5 that what is suggested.	<p>Amend WFZ-P5 (Sense of place) as follows:</p> <p>Require development of public spaces, buildings and other structures to maintain or enhance the sense of place and distinctive form, quality and amenity of the Waterfront Zone including, where relevant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A balance of buildings and open space with no more than 35% building-site coverage over the whole Waterfront Zone to form a sense of openness and transition between the dense city centre environment and the expansiveness of Te Whanganui a Tara; <p>...</p>	Accept.	Yes.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.14	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP5	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports WFZ-P5 and the direction to provide a balance of buildings and open space.</p> <p>The Trust also supports the clarifying amendment sought by the Wellington Civic Trust. The wording proposed in the PDP of 'building site coverage' doesn't make it clear that 35% coverage is intended to apply across the Waterfront Zone as a whole, not to individual building 'sites'. This intention is more clearly expressed in WFZ-S6. The Trust suggests a reference to 'building footprint' would be an alternative way of providing clarity.</p>	Allow / Seeks that the submission point is allowed, with minor amendment, or wording to similar effect sought by 388.77.	Accept.	Yes.
Fabric Limited	Property 425.88	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP5	Support	Supports the objectives and policies for the Waterfront Zone generally, and specifically supports the development of buildings to maintain or enhance the sense of place and distinctive form, quality and amenity of the Waterfront Zone (WFZ-P5).	Retain WFZ-P5 (Sense of place) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.15	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP5	Support	The Fale Malae Trust supports WFZ-P5 and the direction to provide a balance of buildings and open space. The Trust also supports the clarifying amendment sought by the Wellington Civic Trust. The wording proposed in the PDP of 'building site coverage' doesn't make it clear that 35% coverage is intended to apply across the Waterfront Zone as a whole, not to individual building 'sites'. This intention is more clearly expressed in WFZ-S6. The Trust suggests a reference to 'building footprint' would be an alternative way of providing clarity. Allow submission 425.88, with the minor amendment, or wording to similar effect, sought by 388.77.	Amend / Seeks that WFZ-P5 (Sense of place) is amended as follows: 1. A balance of buildings and open space with no more than 35% building site coverage over the whole Waterfront Zone to form a sense of openness and transition between the dense city centre environment and the expansiveness of Te Whanganui a Tara; ...	Accept in part.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.78	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP7	Support	[No specific reason provided other than decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain WFZ-P7 (Protection of public open space) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.16	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP7	Support	The Fale Malae Trust supports WFZ-P7 and the recognition that buildings in public open space can improve the space for public use and enjoyment. The Trust is concerned that the requirement that buildings do not 'dominate or cumulatively diminish' the public open space is a highly subjective criteria. The quality requirements applying to buildings in WFZ-P6 are more objective, including references to buildings being 'complementary and of an appropriate scale'. These or similar requirements would be more appropriate in WFZ-P7. The Wellington Waterfront Framework also makes reference to new buildings being 'in scale' A further appropriate change would be for WFZ-P7 to support buildings that replace existing buildings and improve public open space areas.	Allow / Allow the submission point with the amendment sought.	Accept in part.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.79	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP9	Support	[No specific reason provided other than decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain WFZ-P9 (Sustainable long term use) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.17	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP9	Support	The Fale Malae Trust supports the direction in WFZ-P9 for long term sustainable use and redevelopment, and for providing for flexible ground floor use.	Allow	Accept.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.80	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP10	Support	[No specific reason provided other than decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain WFZ-P10 (Ahi kā) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.18	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP10	Support	The Fale Malae Trust supports WFZ-P10 and recognising and providing for cultural associations and development interests of mana whenua in the Waterfront Zone.	Allow	Accept.	No.
VicLabour	414.48	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZP10	Support	Supportive of ahi ka provisions	Retain WFZ-P10 (Ahi kā) as notified. [Inferred decision requested]	Accept.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.89	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR1	Support	Supports commercial activities being permitted as part of the range of activities anticipated in the Waterfront Zone.	Retain WFZ-R1 (Commercial Activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.338	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR4	Support	Supports the rule as it permits the establishment of emergency service facilities within the WFZ	Retain WFZ-R4 (Emergency service facilities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.81	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR6	Oppose	WFZ-R6 is opposed. Public transport activities should be removed from permitted activities so that they default to Discretionary status.	Delete WFZ-R6 (Public transport activities) in its entirety.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.82	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR7	Oppose in part	WFZ-R7 is partially opposed and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-R7 (Visitor accommodation) with amendment.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Civic Trust	388.83	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR7	Amend	Considers that WFZ-R7 should be amended so that it applies to Visitor accommodation on the same basis as residential activities throughout the zone.	Amend WFZ-R7 (Visitor accommodation) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted <u>Where:</u> <u>a. The activity is located above ground floor level. Cross-reference – also refer to NOISE-R5 and NOISE-S4 for noise-sensitive controls near the Port Zone.</u>	Reject.	No.
Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	240.778	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR8	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 WFZ-R8 (Residential activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.84	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR10	Support	WFZ-R10 is supported as it provides limited permitted car parking activity status, and the default to non-complying in this area. The car parking for people with mobility issues is particularly supported.	Retain WFZ-R10 (Car parking activities) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.339	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR12	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the WFZ is a permitted activity.	Retain WFZ-R12 (Maintenance and repair of buildings, structures, and public open space) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.90	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR12	Support	Considers that it is appropriate for the maintenance and repair of buildings to be permitted in the Waterfront Zone.	Retain WFZ-R12 (Maintenance and repair of buildings) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.340	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR13	Support	Supports the rule as the demolition or removal of buildings and structures within the WFZ is a permitted activity.	Retain WFZ-R13 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.311	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR13	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 WFZ-R13 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.312	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR13	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 WFZ-R13 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) to include a rule requirement that permitted activity status is subject to building and demolition waste being disposed of at an approved facility.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.85	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR13	Support in part	WFZ-R13 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-R13 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) with amendment.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.86	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR13	Amend	Oppose the provision that buildings in the Waterfront Zone may be demolished to provide private outdoor living space. That is inconsistent with the rules applying to residential activities and contrary to the description of the purpose of the area as for public use and future generations.	Modify WFZ-R13 1.a.ii (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as follows": "ii. Enables the creation of public space or for private outdoor living space ; or	Accept.	Yes.
Fabric Property Limited	425.91	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR13	Support	Supports the permitted activity status for demolition of a building for the purposes of avoiding threats to life and property, and for the purposes of constructing a new building.	Retain WFZ-R13.1 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	F559.19	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR13	Support	The Fale Malae Trust supports proposed rule WFZ-R13.1 which provides for demolition of buildings as a permitted activity where the demolition is required for the purposes of constructing a new building or adding to or altering an existing building that has an approved resource consent or resource consent is being sought concurrently under WFZ-R14 or WFZ-R15. The flexibility sought by Fabric Property Limited for demolition under WFZ-R13.2, that does not meet the permitted activity requirements, is also supported. The permitted activity requirement for resource consents for new buildings to already be in existence, or applications to be 'concurrent', is stringent and does not recognise the staged nature of many developments. Restricted discretionary status, with regard being had to the status of redevelopment plans for the demolition site, strikes the appropriate balance. The non-notification direction is supported. If restricted-discretionary status for demolition that does not comply with permitted activity requirements is not supported, discretionary activity status is sought.	Allow	Accept in part.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fabric Limited	Property 425.92	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR13	Amend	<p>Considers that there is a risk that the non-complying activity status for activities that do not comply with WFZ-R13 may constrain staged developments that require demolition and clearing of a site to enable well-planned development.</p> <p>A restricted discretionary activity status with preclusion of notification would provide greater certainty for development while ensuring that Council still retains appropriate discretion to ensure quality design outcomes.</p>	<p>Amend WFZ-R13.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Activity Status: Non-complying <u>Restricted Discretionary</u></p> <p>...</p>	Reject.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.20	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR13	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports proposed rule WFZ-R13.1 which provides for demolition of buildings as a permitted activity where the demolition is required for the purposes of constructing a new building or adding to or altering an existing building that has an approved resource consent or resource consent is being sought concurrently under WFZ-R14 or WFZ-R15.</p> <p>The flexibility sought by Fabric Property Limited for demolition under WFZ-R13.2, that does not meet the permitted activity requirements, is also supported. The permitted activity requirement for resource consents for new buildings to already be in existence, or applications to be 'concurrent', is stringent and does not recognise the staged nature of many developments. Restricted discretionary status, with regard being had to the status of redevelopment plans for the demolition site, strikes the appropriate balance.</p> <p>The non-notification direction is supported.</p> <p>If restricted-discretionary status for demolition that does not comply with permitted activity requirements is not supported, discretionary activity status is sought.</p>	Allow	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.3	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R13	Oppose	The submission seeks that demolition of buildings in the Waterfront Zone that is not permitted should be restricted discretionary. This is unreasonable, given the expectation of permitted activities (which includes concurrent resource consent application being made for a replacement building. The idea that this would constrain staged developments is highly unlikely. No list of matters for restricted discretion is given, so the submission is incomplete.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Fabric Limited	Property 425.93	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR13	Support	<p>Considers that there is a risk that the non-complying activity status for activities that do not comply with WFZ-R13 may constrain staged developments that require demolition and clearing of a site to enable well-planned development.</p> <p>Supports the preclusion of public and limited notification for demolition.</p> <p>A restricted discretionary activity status with preclusion of notification would provide greater certainty for development while ensuring that Council still retains appropriate discretion to ensure quality design outcomes.</p>	Retain notification clauses under WFZ-R13.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.21	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR13	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports proposed rule WFZ-R13.1 which provides for demolition of buildings as a permitted activity where the demolition is required for the purposes of constructing a new building or adding to or altering an existing building that has an approved resource consent or resource consent is being sought concurrently under WFZ-R14 or WFZ-R15.</p> <p>The flexibility sought by Fabric Property Limited for demolition under WFZ-R13.2, that does not meet the permitted activity requirements, is also supported. The permitted activity requirement for resource consents for new buildings to already be in existence, or applications to be 'concurrent', is stringent and does not recognise the staged nature of many developments. Restricted discretionary status, with regard being had to the status of redevelopment plans for the demolition site, strikes the appropriate balance.</p> <p>The non-notification direction is supported.</p> <p>If restricted-discretionary status for demolition that does not comply with permitted activity requirements is not supported, discretionary activity status is sought.</p>	Allow	Accept.	No.
Fabric Limited	Property 425.94	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR13	Amend	Seeks for a discretionary activity status, which would be consistent with MCZ-R19 in the Metropolitan Centre Zone.	Seeks that if WFZ-R13.2 (Demolition or removal of buildings and structures) is not amended to be a Restricted Discretionary activity, the activity status is changed to Restricted Discretionary.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.22	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR13	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports proposed rule WFZ-R13.1 which provides for demolition of buildings as a permitted activity where the demolition is required for the purposes of constructing a new building or adding to or altering an existing building that has an approved resource consent or resource consent is being sought concurrently under WFZ-R14 or WFZ-R15.</p> <p>The flexibility sought by Fabric Property Limited for demolition under WFZ-R13.2, that does not meet the permitted activity requirements, is also supported. The permitted activity requirement for resource consents for new buildings to already be in existence, or applications to be 'concurrent', is stringent and does not recognise the staged nature of many developments. Restricted discretionary status, with regard being had to the status of redevelopment plans for the demolition site, strikes the appropriate balance.</p> <p>The non-notification direction is supported.</p> <p>If restricted-discretionary status for demolition that does not comply with permitted activity requirements is not supported, discretionary activity status is sought.</p>	Allow	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.4	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R13	Oppose	The Waterfront Zone has no comparison with the MCZ in terms of activity status, being public realm for the people of Wellington.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.341	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR14	Support	Supports the rule as additions and alterations to buildings and structures within the WFZ is a permitted activity.	Retain WFZ-R14 (Alterations or additions to buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept in part.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.87	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR14	Support in part	WFZ-R14 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-R14 (Alterations or additions to buildings and structures) with amendment.	Accept in part.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.23	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR14	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.</p> <p>The proposed permitted status requirement that the aggregate area of buildings and structures in the Public Open Space Zone does not exceed 200sqm per hectare is appropriate and consistent with WFZ-O1 and should be retained. The sought amendment to limit the aggregate area to 50sqm per hectare is too restrictive and would not enable the variety of activities and structures that contribute to the Waterfront Zone's identity and sense of place.</p> <p>WFZ-R14.2 should more clearly allow for replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures in the public open space zone to be assessed as a discretionary activity. Where an existing building is replaced by a new building, the change in effects is likely to be more similar to an alteration and should be assessed as such.</p> <p>Also, or alternatively, WFZ-R14.5 and WFZ-R14.6 should be amended to apply to public open space, with wording amendments to make clear that these rules also apply to replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures that are removed.</p>	Allow / Seeks that WFZ-R14 is amended to clearly include replacement buildings and structures.	Accept in part.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.88	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR14	Amend	Oppose the permitted aggregate area of additions and alterations to buildings and structures in Public Open Space in the Zone being set at 200m2 per hectare in 1. Of this rule. This is too high given the dispersed and non-continuous nature of the spaces. The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications. In 5. of this rule – Alterations or additions to buildings and structures - We oppose the 5% footprint screen between restricted discretionary and discretionary, and thus between whether notification is discretionary or required. We seek that this is halved, given the size and location of some of the existing buildings in relation to the unclassified (but well-used) areas which the space may be taken from. An alternative would be to set a maximum area of additional floorspace.	Amend WFZ-R14.1 (Alterations or additions to buildings and structures) as follows: ... b. The alterations or additions result in the building or structure being: i. Less than 30 m2 in site coverage; and ii. Less than 4 metres high; and c. The aggregate area of all buildings and structures in the contiguous public open space does not exceed 50 200 m2 per hectare.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.24	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR14	Oppose	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.</p> <p>The proposed permitted status requirement that the aggregate area of buildings and structures in the Public Open Space Zone does not exceed 200sqm per hectare is appropriate and consistent with WFZ-O1 and should be retained. The sought amendment to limit the aggregate area to 50sqm per hectare is too restrictive and would not enable the variety of activities and structures that contribute to the Waterfront Zone's identity and sense of place.</p> <p>WFZ-R14.2 should more clearly allow for replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures in the public open space zone to be assessed as a discretionary activity. Where an existing building is replaced by a new building, the change in effects is likely to be more similar to an alteration and should be assessed as such.</p> <p>Also, or alternatively, WFZ-R14.5 and WFZ-R14.6 should be amended to apply to public open space, with wording amendments to make clear that these rules also apply to replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures that are removed.</p>	Disallow / Seeks that WFZ-R14 is amended to clearly include replacement buildings and structures.	Accept in part.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.89	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR14	Amend	<p>Oppose the permitted aggregate area of additions and alterations to buildings and structures in Public Open Space in the Zone being set at 200m² per hectare in 1. Of this rule. This is too high given the dispersed and non-continuous nature of the spaces. The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications. In 5. of this rule – Alterations or additions to buildings and structures - We oppose the 5% footprint screen between restricted discretionary and discretionary, and thus between whether notification is discretionary or required. We seek that this is halved, given the size and location of some of the existing buildings in relation to the unclassified (but well-used) areas which the space may be taken from. An alternative would be to set a maximum area of additional floorspace.</p>	<p>Amend WFZ-R14.2 (Alterations or additions to buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>The assessment of the activity must have regard to the Principles and Outcomes in the Wellington City Council Design Guides Introduction [2022] and the Wellington Waterfront Framework".</p>	Reject.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.25	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR14	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.</p> <p>The proposed permitted status requirement that the aggregate area of buildings and structures in the Public Open Space Zone does not exceed 200sqm per hectare is appropriate and consistent with WFZ-O1 and should be retained. The sought amendment to limit the aggregate area to 50sqm per hectare is too restrictive and would not enable the variety of activities and structures that contribute to the Waterfront Zone's identity and sense of place.</p> <p>WFZ-R14.2 should more clearly allow for replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures in the public open space zone to be assessed as a discretionary activity. Where an existing building is replaced by a new building, the change in effects is likely to be more similar to an alteration and should be assessed as such.</p> <p>Also, or alternatively, WFZ-R14.5 and WFZ-R14.6 should be amended to apply to public open space, with wording amendments to make clear that these rules also apply to replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures that are removed.</p>	Allow / Seeks that WFZ-R14 is amended to clearly include replacement buildings and structures.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Civic Trust	388.90	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR14	Amend	Oppose the permitted aggregate area of additions and alterations to buildings and structures in Public Open Space in the Zone being set at 200m ² per hectare in 1. Of this rule. This is too high given the dispersed and non-continuous nature of the spaces. The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications. In 5. of this rule – Alterations or additions to buildings and structures - We oppose the 5% footprint screen between restricted discretionary and discretionary, and thus between whether notification is discretionary or required. We seek that this is halved, given the size and location of some of the existing buildings in relation to the unclassified (but well-used) areas which the space may be taken from. An alternative would be to set a maximum area of additional floorspace.	Amend WFZ-R14.4 (Alterations or additions to buildings and structures) as follows: ... The assessment of the activity must have regard to the Principles and Outcomes in the Wellington City Council Design Guides Introduction [2022] and the Wellington Waterfront Framework”.	Reject.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.26	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR14	Support	The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: “Wellington’s Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations.” Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported. The proposed permitted status requirement that the aggregate area of buildings and structures in the Public Open Space Zone does not exceed 200sqm per hectare is appropriate and consistent with WFZ-O1 and should be retained. The sought amendment to limit the aggregate area to 50sqm per hectare is too restrictive and would not enable the variety of activities and structures that contribute to the Waterfront Zone’s identity and sense of place. WFZ-R14.2 should more clearly allow for replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures in the public open space zone to be assessed as a discretionary activity. Where an existing building is replaced by a new building, the change in effects is likely to be more similar to an alteration and should be assessed as such. Also, or alternatively, WFZ-R14.5 and WFZ-R14.6 should be amended to apply to public open space, with wording amendments to make clear that these rules also apply to replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures that are removed.	Allow / Seeks that WFZ-R14 is amended to clearly include replacement buildings and structures.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.91	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR14	Amend	Oppose the permitted aggregate area of additions and alterations to buildings and structures in Public Open Space in the Zone being set at 200m ² per hectare in 1. Of this rule. This is too high given the dispersed and non-continuous nature of the spaces. The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications. In 5. of this rule – Alterations or additions to buildings and structures - We oppose the 5% footprint screen between restricted discretionary and discretionary, and thus between whether notification is discretionary or required. We seek that this is halved, given the size and location of some of the existing buildings in relation to the unclassified (but well-used) areas which the space may be taken from. An alternative would be to set a maximum area of additional floorspace.	Amend WFZ-R14.5 (Alterations or additions to buildings and structures) as follows: ... The assessment of the activity must have regard to the Principles and Outcomes in the Wellington City Council Design Guides Introduction [2022] and the Wellington Waterfront Framework”.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.27	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR14	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.</p> <p>The proposed permitted status requirement that the aggregate area of buildings and structures in the Public Open Space Zone does not exceed 200sqm per hectare is appropriate and consistent with WFZ-O1 and should be retained. The sought amendment to limit the aggregate area to 50sqm per hectare is too restrictive and would not enable the variety of activities and structures that contribute to the Waterfront Zone's identity and sense of place.</p> <p>WFZ-R14.2 should more clearly allow for replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures in the public open space zone to be assessed as a discretionary activity. Where an existing building is replaced by a new building, the change in effects is likely to be more similar to an alteration and should be assessed as such.</p> <p>Also, or alternatively, WFZ-R14.5 and WFZ-R14.6 should be amended to apply to public open space, with wording amendments to make clear that these rules also apply to replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures that are removed.</p>	Allow / Seeks that WFZ-R14 is amended to clearly include replacement buildings and structures.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.92	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR14	Amend	<p>Oppose the permitted aggregate area of additions and alterations to buildings and structures in Public Open Space in the Zone being set at 200m² per hectare in 1. Of this rule. This is too high given the dispersed and non-continuous nature of the spaces. The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications. In 5. of this rule – Alterations or additions to buildings and structures - We oppose the 5% footprint screen between restricted discretionary and discretionary, and thus between whether notification is discretionary or required. We seek that this is halved, given the size and location of some of the existing buildings in relation to the unclassified (but well-used) areas which the space may be taken from. An alternative would be to set a maximum area of additional floorspace.</p>	<p>Amend WFZ-R14.6 (Alterations or additions to buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>The assessment of the activity must have regard to the Principles and Outcomes in the Wellington City Council Design Guides Introduction [2022] and the Wellington Waterfront Framework".</p>	Reject.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.28	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR14	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.</p> <p>The proposed permitted status requirement that the aggregate area of buildings and structures in the Public Open Space Zone does not exceed 200sqm per hectare is appropriate and consistent with WFZ-O1 and should be retained. The sought amendment to limit the aggregate area to 50sqm per hectare is too restrictive and would not enable the variety of activities and structures that contribute to the Waterfront Zone's identity and sense of place.</p> <p>WFZ-R14.2 should more clearly allow for replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures in the public open space zone to be assessed as a discretionary activity. Where an existing building is replaced by a new building, the change in effects is likely to be more similar to an alteration and should be assessed as such.</p> <p>Also, or alternatively, WFZ-R14.5 and WFZ-R14.6 should be amended to apply to public open space, with wording amendments to make clear that these rules also apply to replacement buildings and structures that occupy the same (or lesser) footprint than existing buildings and structures that are removed.</p>	Allow / Seeks that WFZ-R14 is amended to clearly include replacement buildings and structures.	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Civic Trust	388.93	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR14	Amend	Oppose the permitted aggregate area of additions and alterations to buildings and structures in Public Open Space in the Zone being set at 200m ² per hectare in 1. Of this rule. This is too high given the dispersed and non-continuous nature of the spaces. The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications. In 5. of this rule – Alterations or additions to buildings and structures - We oppose the 5% footprint screen between restricted discretionary and discretionary, and thus between whether notification is discretionary or required. We seek that this is halved, given the size and location of some of the existing buildings in relation to the unclassified (but well-used) areas which the space may be taken from. An alternative would be to set a maximum area of additional floorspace.	Amend WFZ-R14.5 (Alterations or additions to buildings and structures) as follows: ... Where: a. The alterations or additions do not extend the footprint of the existing building by more than 2.55% of the footprint at 18 July 2022; and	Reject.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.95	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR14	Support in part	Supports WFZ-R14 in part and in particular supports the Restricted Discretionary activity status provided for additions and alterations that do not exceed a building footprint by more than 5% under WFZ-R14.5.	Retain WFZ-R14.5 (Alterations or additions to buildings and structures) with respect to the Restricted Discretionary activity status where a building footprint is not extended by more than 5%.	Accept.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.5	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R14	Oppose	The submission is contrary to a Civic Trust Submission, which seeks a reduction in area under this rule.	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.96	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR14	Amend	Seeks amendments to WFZ-R14.6 to remove the mandatory public notification clause. It is more appropriate for notification to be determined on a case-by-case basis, and in some cases non-notification may be appropriate. While Fabric recognises the high degree of public interest in the Waterfront area, public notification and the associated risk of litigation impose a high potential cost on development. There are means to ensure the effects of an alteration on the public realm are appropriately taken into account without the need for public notification, and retain the Council's discretion to publicly notify applications that are appropriate.	Amend WFZ-R14.6 (Alterations or additions to buildings and structures) as follows: ... Notification status: An application for resource consent made in respect of Rule WFZ-R14.6 must be publicly notified.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.6	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R14	Oppose	The type of development which fits into this category will be encroaching into public space, so must be publicly notified.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.342	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR15	Support	Supports the rule as the construction of buildings and structures within the WFZ is a permitted activity	Retain WFZ-R15 (Construction of new buildings and structures) as notified.	Accept.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.15	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Oppose	The submission is contrary to a Civic Trust Submission, which seeks a reduction in permitted size under this rule	Disallow	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.94	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR15	Support in part	WFZ-R15 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-R15 (Construction of new buildings and structures) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.29	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR15	Support	The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported. The proposed permitted status requirement that the aggregate area of buildings and structures in the Public Open Space Zone does not exceed 200sqm per hectare is appropriate and consistent with WFZ-O1 and should be retained. The sought amendment to limit the aggregate area to 50sqm per hectare is too restrictive and would not enable the variety of activities and structures that contribute to the Waterfront Zone's identity and sense of place.	Allow	Accept in part.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.95	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR15	Support in part	Oppose the permitted aggregate area of new buildings and structures in Public Open Space in the Zone being set at 200m ² per hectare in 1. This is too high given the dispersed and noncontinuous nature of the spaces. The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications.	Retain WFZ-R15.1 (Construction of new buildings and structures) as follows: ... c. The aggregate area of all buildings and structures in the contiguous public open space does not exceed 50200 m ² per hectare."	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.30	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR15	Oppose	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.</p> <p>The proposed permitted status requirement that the aggregate area of buildings and structures in the Public Open Space Zone does not exceed 200sqm per hectare is appropriate and consistent with WFZ-O1 and should be retained. The sought amendment to limit the aggregate area to 50sqm per hectare is too restrictive and would not enable the variety of activities and structures that contribute to the Waterfront Zone's identity and sense of place.</p>	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.96	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR15	Support in part	<p>Oppose the permitted aggregate area of new buildings and structures in Public Open Space in the Zone being set at 200m² per hectare in 1. This is too high given the dispersed and noncontinuous nature of the spaces. The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications.</p>	<p>Retain WFZ-R15.2 (Construction of new buildings and structures) as follows: ... "The assessment of the activity must have regard to the Principles and Outcomes in the Wellington City Council Design Guides Introduction [2022] and the Wellington Waterfront Framework"</p>	Reject.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.31	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR15	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.</p> <p>The proposed permitted status requirement that the aggregate area of buildings and structures in the Public Open Space Zone does not exceed 200sqm per hectare is appropriate and consistent with WFZ-O1 and should be retained. The sought amendment to limit the aggregate area to 50sqm per hectare is too restrictive and would not enable the variety of activities and structures that contribute to the Waterfront Zone's identity and sense of place.</p>	Allow	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.97	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR15	Support in part	<p>Oppose the permitted aggregate area of new buildings and structures in Public Open Space in the Zone being set at 200m² per hectare in 1. This is too high given the dispersed and noncontinuous nature of the spaces. The Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document should also be referred to when making decisions on discretionary activity applications.</p>	<p>Retain WFZ-R15.6 (Construction of new buildings and structures) as follows: ... "The assessment of the activity must have regard to the Principles and Outcomes in the Wellington City Council Design Guides Introduction [2022] and the Wellington Waterfront Framework"</p>	Reject.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.32	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR15	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.</p> <p>The proposed permitted status requirement that the aggregate area of buildings and structures in the Public Open Space Zone does not exceed 200sqm per hectare is appropriate and consistent with WFZ-O1 and should be retained. The sought amendment to limit the aggregate area to 50sqm per hectare is too restrictive and would not enable the variety of activities and structures that contribute to the Waterfront Zone's identity and sense of place.</p>	Allow	Reject.	No.
Fabric Limited	Property 425.97	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR15	Oppose	<p>Considers Restricted Discretionary activity status for WFZ-R15.6 would provide greater certainty for development while ensuring that Council still retains appropriate discretion to ensure quality outcomes for the public realm.</p>	<p>Opposes the Discretionary activity status for WFZ-R15.6 (Construction of new buildings and structures).</p>	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.33	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR15	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports activity status changes in WFZ-R15. In particular, non-complying status is not an appropriate status for new buildings and structures in public open space areas that are replacing existing structures.</p> <p>Where a new building replaces, or is smaller than, an existing building that is removed from the public open space area, this should be assessed as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity.</p> <p>Alternatively, the 'Entire Zone' provisions should be amended to also apply to public open space areas. The proposed assessment matters are appropriate and are sufficient to prevent inappropriate development in public open spaces.</p>	Allow / Seeks that the submission point is allowed to change the activity status under the rule so that buildings replacing existing buildings are assessed as Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary activities.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.7	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Oppose	The submission seeks a more relaxed activity status for buildings, which they acknowledge are in the public realm. This is unreasonable and is opposed.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Fabric Limited	Property 425.98	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR15	Amend	Considers Restricted Discretionary activity status for WFZ-R15.6 would provide greater certainty for development while ensuring that Council still retains appropriate discretion to ensure quality outcomes for the public realm.	<p>Amend WFZ-R15.6 (Construction of new buildings and structures) as follows:</p> <p>...</p> <p>Activity Status: <u>Restricted</u> Discretionary</p> <p>...</p>	Reject.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.34	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR15	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports activity status changes in WFZ-R15. In particular, non-complying status is not an appropriate status for new buildings and structures in public open space areas that are replacing existing structures.</p> <p>Where a new building replaces, or is smaller than, an existing building that is removed from the public open space area, this should be assessed as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity.</p> <p>Alternatively, the 'Entire Zone' provisions should be amended to also apply to public open space areas. The proposed assessment matters are appropriate and are sufficient to prevent inappropriate development in public open spaces.</p>	Allow / Seeks that the submission point is allowed to change the activity status under the rule so that buildings replacing existing buildings are assessed as Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary activities.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.8	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Oppose	The submission seeks a more relaxed activity status for buildings, which they acknowledge are in the public realm. This is unreasonable and is opposed.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Fabric Limited	Property 425.99	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR15	Oppose	Considers it is more appropriate for notification to be determined on a case-by-case basis, and in some cases non-notification may be appropriate. While Fabric recognises the high degree of public interest in the Waterfront area, public notification and the associated risk of litigation impose a high potential cost on development. There are means to ensure the effects of a development on the public realm are appropriately taken into account without the need for public notification.	Opposes the notification clause under WFZ-R15.6 (Construction of new buildings and structures), which requires public notification.	Reject.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.35	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR15	Support	<p>The Fale Malae Trust supports activity status changes in WFZ-R15. In particular, non-complying status is not an appropriate status for new buildings and structures in public open space areas that are replacing existing structures.</p> <p>Where a new building replaces, or is smaller than, an existing building that is removed from the public open space area, this should be assessed as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity.</p> <p>Alternatively, the 'Entire Zone' provisions should be amended to also apply to public open space areas. The proposed assessment matters are appropriate and are sufficient to prevent inappropriate development in public open spaces.</p>	Allow / Seeks that the submission point is allowed to change the activity status under the rule so that buildings replacing existing buildings are assessed as Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary activities.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.9	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Oppose	Public notification is essential for all buildings in this zone because of its importance as public space.	Disallow	Accept.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fabric Property Limited	425.100	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR15	Oppose	Considers it is more appropriate for notification to be determined on a case-by-case basis, and in some cases non-notification may be appropriate. While Fabric recognises the high degree of public interest in the Waterfront area, public notification and the associated risk of litigation impose a high potential cost on development. There are means to ensure the effects of a development on the public realm are appropriately taken into account without the need for public notification.	Amend WFZ-R15.6 (Construction of new buildings and structures) as follows: ... Notification Status: An application for resource consent made in respect of WFZ-R15.6 must be publicly notified.	Reject.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.36	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR15	Support	The Fale Malae Trust supports activity status changes in WFZ-R15. In particular, non-complying status is not an appropriate status for new buildings and structures in public open space areas that are replacing existing structures. Where a new building replaces, or is smaller than, an existing building that is removed from the public open space area, this should be assessed as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity. Alternatively, the 'Entire Zone' provisions should be amended to also apply to public open space areas. The proposed assessment matters are appropriate and are sufficient to prevent inappropriate development in public open spaces.	Allow / Seeks that the submission point is allowed to change the activity status under the rule so that buildings replacing existing buildings are assessed as Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary activities.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.10	Part 3 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-R15	Oppose	Public notification is essential for all buildings in this zone because of its importance as public space.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.98	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR16	Support in part	WFZ-R16 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-R16 (Development of new public space, or modification of existing public open space) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.37	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR16	Support	The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.	Allow	Accept in part.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.99	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR16	Amend	Considers that WFZ-R16 should be amended to reference the Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document when making decisions on discretionary activity applications.	Amend WFZ-R16 (Development of new public space, or modification of existing public open space) to reference the Wellington Waterfront Framework.	Reject.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.38	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR16	Support	The Fale Malae Trust supports the proposed direction to have regard to the Wellington Waterfront Framework. The Trust supports the vision of the Framework: "Wellington's Waterfront is a special place that welcomes all people to live, work and play in the beautiful and inspiring spaces and architecture that connects our city to the sea and protect our heritage for future generations." Incorporating the Framework values of heritage, diversity, cultures and sense of place into the Waterfront Zone provisions is strongly supported.	Allow	Reject.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.343	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR17	Support in part	Supports the rule as the matters of discretion for these restricted discretionary activities include consideration of the availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, particularly where this may involve the conversion of non-habitable rooms to residential use. A minor amendment is however sought to include the necessity to connect to three waters infrastructure including for the purposes of firefighting	Supports WFZ-R17 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings to residential activities), with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.344	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR17	Amend	Supports the rule as the matters of discretion for these restricted discretionary activities include consideration of the availability and connection to existing or planned three waters infrastructure, particularly where this may involve the conversion of non-habitable rooms to residential use. A minor amendment is however sought to include the necessity to connect to three waters infrastructure including for the purposes of firefighting	Amend WFZ-R17 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings to residential activities) as follows: Matters of discretion are: ... 4. The availability and connection of existing or planned three waters infrastructure, including for firefighting purposes; and	Reject.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Wellington Civic Trust	388.100	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR17	Support in part	WFZ-R17 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-R17 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings to residential activities) with amendment.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.101	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR17	Amend	Considers that WFZ-R17 should be amended to reference the Wellington Waterfront Framework as the guiding document when making decisions on discretionary activity applications.	Amend WFZ-R17 (Conversion of buildings or parts of buildings to residential activities) to reference the Wellington Waterfront Framework.	Reject.	No.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	273.345	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR18	Amend	Considers it important that screening of outdoor storage areas as a visual mitigation will not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities. Such mitigation should be constructed in a way to ensure the signs and facilities are visible / accessible for FENZ. Where this is not possible, mitigation should not be required. Note: submitter refers to WFZ-R11, this is an error.	Amend WFZ-R18 (Outdoor storage areas) as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The storage area is screened by either a fence or landscaping of 1.8m in height from any adjoining road or site. b. <u>Screening does not obscure emergency or safety signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves, or other emergency response facilities.</u>	Accept.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.102	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR18	Support in part	WFZ-R18 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-R18 (Outdoor storage areas) with amendment.	Accept in part.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.39	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR18	Oppose	The submission seeking that outdoor storage areas are limited to 10m2 is not supported. This size area would be inadequate for many buildings. Ensuring adequate screening is more important than limiting total area.	Disallow / Disallow submission in part.	Accept in part.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.103	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR18	Amend	Considers that WFZ-R18 should be amended so that outdoor storage areas should either precluded from establishing, or, if permitted, be extremely limited in area within the Waterfront Zone. The screening provision is inadequate for a primarily public area, as screening from road or site boundaries provides inadequate protection for users of the area.	Amend WFZ-R18 (Outdoor storage areas) as follows: 1. Activity status: Permitted Where: a. The storage area is screened by a fence or landscaping of 1.8m in height <u>around its immediate perimeter</u> and from any adjoining road or site; and b. The storage area has a <u>maximum area of 10m2</u>	Reject.	No.
Fale Malae Trust	FS59.40	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZR18	Oppose	The submission seeking that outdoor storage areas are limited to 10m2 is not supported. This size area would be inadequate for many buildings. Ensuring adequate screening is more important than limiting total area.	Disallow / Disallow submission in part.	Accept.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.101	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZS1	Oppose in part	The Meridian Building at 33 Customhouse Quay is located in the Special Purpose Waterfront zone. Supports the building height standard as set out in WFZ-S1 in as far as it enables building heights at least equivalent to the height of the existing building at 55 Lady Elizabeth Lane. The Proposed Plan maps show that the maximum height for the Meridian Building site is 17.7m. Seeks a building height of at least 23.1m for the meridian building site to enable an additional floor to be added. This is consistent with the nearby PWC building and would improve the viability of the works required to the building for earthquake strengthening. It is appropriate to enable minor additional height in this location, while recognising and leveraging the existing built form investment.	Opposes the height limit under WFZ-S1 (Maximum building height outside of Public Open Space and Areas of Change) with respect to 33 Customhouse Quay	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.11	Part 4 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-S1	Oppose	The additional height sought for a specific building is contrary to the schema for building heights in the Waterfront Zone and contrary to the public interest in this area	Disallow	Accept.	No.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
Fabric Property Limited	425.102	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZS1	Amend	The Meridian Building at 33 Customhouse Quay is located in the Special Purpose Waterfront zone. Supports the building height standard as set out in WFZ-S1 in as far as it enables building heights at least equivalent to the height of the existing building at 55 Lady Elizabeth Lane. The Proposed Plan maps show that the maximum height for the Meridian Building site is 17.7m. Seeks a building height of at least 23.1m for the meridian building site to enable an additional floor to be added. This is consistent with the nearby PWC building and would improve the viability of the works required to the building for earthquake strengthening. It is appropriate to enable minor additional height in this location, while recognising and leveraging the existing built form investment.	Amend WFZ-S1 (Maximum building height outside of Public Open Space and Areas of Change) is amended to enable buildin heights of at least 23.1m for 33 Customhouse Quay	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.12	Part 4 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-S1	Oppose	The additional height sought for a specific building is contrary to the schema for building heights in the Waterfront Zone and contrary to the public interest in this area	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.103	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZS2	Oppose	The Meridian Building at 33 Customhouse Quay is located adjacent to a Minimum Sunlight Access Public Space in relation to Kumutoto Park Fabric seeks deletion of WFZ-S2.	Option 1: Delete WFZ-S2 (Minimum Sunlight Access - Public Space) in its entirety.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.14	Part 4 / Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZ-S2	Oppose	Protection of sunlight access is essential for the Waterfront Zone. The request to remove one protected area is unreasonable and contrary to the interest of users and the wider public.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.104	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZS6	Support in part	WFZ-S6 is partially supported and an amendment is sought.	Retain WFZ-S6 (Waterfront Zone site coverage) with amendment.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.105	Special Purpose Zones / Waterfront Zone / WFZS6	Amend	Considers that WFZ-S6 should be amended to not refer to the Waterfront coverage as a "site". The reference to "site" in relation to coverage may result in difficulty in interpreting this rule. The Zone consists of a number of sites (as defined), whereas the rule, in line with the policy, is intended to apply to the Zone as a whole.	Amend the title of WFZ-S6 (Waterfront Zone site coverage) as follows: Waterfront Zone site coverage 1. All development must result in the sum of all buildings in the Waterfront Zone having a site coverage of less than 35% of the whole Waterfront Zone. ...	Accept in part.	Yes.
Greater Wellington Regional Council	351.45	Interpretation Subpart / Definitions / RECLAMATION	Amend	Considers that the definition is inconsistent with the regional plan definition.	Seeks to amend the Definition of 'Reclamation' to align with regional plan definition.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.2	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	[No specific reason provided other than decision requested - refer to original submission]	Seeks to extend Public Open Space areas in the Waterfront Zone wherever possible.	Accept in part.	Yes.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	Considers that the area between the Circa building and the Te Papa building has been omitted from the Waterfront Public Open Space Zone and should be included. This area is a key open space area and one of the most heavily-used in the whole Zone.	Amend the extent of the Waterfront Public Open Space overlay to include the space between the Circa and Te Papa.	Reject.	No.
Fabric Property Limited	425.3	Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Amend	The Meridian Building at 33 Customhouse Quay is located adjacent to a Minimum Sunlight Access Public Space in relation to Kumutoto Park Fabric seeks deletion of WFZ-S2.	Option 2: If WFZ-S2 (Minimum Sunlight Access - Public Space) is not deleted in its entirety, then: Seeks the Minimum Sunlight access Public Space overlay is deleted in relation to Kumutoto Park.	Reject.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	FS83.13	General / Mapping / Mapping General / Mapping General	Oppose	Protection of sunlight access is essential for the Waterfront Zone. The request to remove one protected area is unreasonable and contrary to the interest of users and the wider public.	Disallow	Accept.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.4	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	The Waterfront Zone at the former Lambton Harbour Area is supported in concept, but some specific issues temper support.	Retain the Waterfront Zone in the former Lambton Harbour Area.	Accept.	No.
Wellington Civic Trust	388.5	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support in part	All areas mapped and classified as Waterfront Public Open Space are supported. Enlargement of these zones is sought wherever possible.	Retain all the areas shown as Public Open Space in the Waterfront Zone.	Accept in part.	Yes.

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter / Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearings Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP?
CentrePort Limited	402.1	Mapping / Retain Zone / Retain Zone	Support	Supports Waterfront zoning. CentrePort owns the triangle of land between Lady Elizabeth Lane and Waterloo and Interislander wharves. Previously this land was included as being part of the Coastal Marine Area. It is an integral part of the future development of both of these wharves which are specifically recognised through Policy 51 (Heritage demolition) and Policy 149 (Lambton Harbour Area) of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan. While CentrePort supports this Zoning, this is on the basis that any redevelopment proposal for this area will be assessed for its compatibility with urban form and other matters, rather than an acceptance that the zero height limit indicates that no built structures can or should occur. [Refer to original submission for map extent]	Retain Waterfront zoning at the triangle of land between Lady Elizabeth Lane and Waterloo and Interislander wharves. [Refer to original submission for map extent].	Accept.	No.
Steve Dunn	288.3	Other / Other / Other	Support	Considers that the provision of new public space and well-designed streets is critical as the central city intensifies to ensure the health and wellbeing of the new residents and should have adequate protection for sunlight access and protect from building development or shading. Considers that the current provision under the Lambton Harbour plan allows buildings for a Fale Malae on Frank Kitts Park if allowed under a resource consent application. This area has always been open space and a building should be at the transitional building site between Te Papa and Waitangi Park.	Seeks that Frank Kitts Park and Waitangi Park are vested as reserves under the Reserves Act.	Outside of scope. Forwarded to other Council staff processes.	No.

Submissions addressed in ISSP wrap up hearing

Submitter Name	Sub No / Point No	Sub-part / Chapter /Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Independent Hearing Panel Recommendation	Changes to PDP? Y/N
Wellington Civic Trust	388.1	Other / Other / Other	Amend	Considers that the Wellington Waterfront Framework 2001 should be completed. The Wellington Waterfront Framework 2001 was intended to be Stage One of a three-stage process. Stage two was to prepare detailed plans for each of the sub-areas, and Stage three was an implementation and monitoring stage. The current Framework is thus no more than a framework, as has been pointed out by the Environment Court.	Seeks that the Council completes the unfinished work on the Wellington Waterfront Framework so that it provides greater detail for the future of the distinctive areas of the waterfront.	Reject	No